THEOLOGY

A Monthly Journal of Historic Christianity

Edited by the Rev. S. C. Carpenter, D.D., Master of the Temple, c/o S.P.C.K. House, Northumberland Avenue, London, W.C. 2, to whom MSS. should be sent.

Vol. XXIX AUGUST, 1934 No. 170

EDITORIAL

The temptation to "divide the world with a hatchet," as Father Tyrrell used to say, is in general one to be resisted. On the other hand, as Mrs. Cluppins said in court on a famous occasion, "the voices was very loud, sir, and forced themselves upon my ear." The Lambeth Appeal to all Christian People in 1920 and the Lausanne Conference of 1927 were so splendid that it is impossible not to think about Reunion, and at the least very difficult not to divide the world into those who care about it and those who do not. Those who do not care are very numerous, but wholly unprofitable. Whether they are indifferent outsiders, or wrong-headed Christians who think that divisions are a good way of putting the churches on their mettle, or simple, genial souls who only want controversy to cease and are made quite content by an occasional joint-service on Armistice Day, they do not help us. The only way is to care, as Father Hebert does, as Canon Guy Rogers does, about it, and to look forward to the Great Church of the Future. This seems to be the test. Nonconformists who only want some kind of recognition for themselves, Anglicans whose first article of faith is "I believe in the Established Church," Anglo-Catholics who think that we have nothing to learn from the Free Churches, Westerns who forget the East, Easterns who forget the West, all these still lack the necessary vision.

The vision is Œcumenical. Domestic problems are not going to be solved till they are seen against the true background. In recent years some very important advances have been made. In 1840 Mr. William Palmer, armed with introductions from the President of Magdalen, Dr. Routh, then aged eighty-five, went to Russia. Newman wrote of his visit that "Palmer seems to have difficulty in persuading the Russians that we are much of

a Church; their definition of us was a Church which had cast off its Patriarch, was somehow Calvinistic, and had no discipline." Since then the work of J. M. Neale, W. J. Birkbeck and J. A. Douglas has borne fruit. The validity of Anglican Orders has been accepted by the Patriarchates of Constantinople and Jerusalem, and official delegations have been sent to Lambeth, though a note from Constantinople, which we hope to print next month, warns us that the Orthodox lay theologian does not always move so fast as the Orthodox Patriarch. With the Old Catholics, a small but important body, which traces its unquestionable descent from the pre-Reformation diocese of Utrecht and has received considerable reinforcements at various times since 1870 from those who were unable to accept Papal claims, we have now (1932) concluded a treaty of full amity and inter-communion. A slightly more guarded form of fellowship has been reached with the Swedish Church. Conversations are now going on with the Church of Finland. With Rome, not much has been done. The influence of the dominant party in English Roman Catholicism has hitherto been strong enough to prevent action. But on the Continent and even in England there are Roman Catholics who take a very different view, and the mere fact that the Malines Conversations were held in 1924 is of great significance. The official Roman theory, "Come over to us, and you will find that we treat you very well," does not contain much that we shall find it possible to use, but there is a great deal behind that, especially in the Liturgical movement, which is more promising, and anyhow at Malines a small breach has been made in a stiff, old wall.

It is against this sort of Œcumenical background that we must survey domestic problems. It is often said that the Orthodox are in the East, the Old Catholics are in Holland, Germany and Switzerland, the Swedes are in Sweden. Relations with them are an affair for the authorities to arrange, and only concern most of us when we travel, whereas the Nonconformists are at our doors. The Roman Catholics are also at our doors, but those of them who are geographically nearest to us are in other respects the most remote, and the quest for Reunion on honourable terms is in England a rather one-sided quest. There remain the Free Churches. Do they desire Reunion? Some of them have been known to begin with the sort of initial *non possumus* which prevents any further action. Thus one Minister said at a joint conference, "It is all very well, but I for my part will never unite with the Greeks." This will not do. They must mean business.

What is the basis? The original Lambeth Quadrilateral of 1878, which ought really to be called the Chicago Quadliteral, was (1) the Holy Scriptures, (2) the Apostles' and Nicene Creeds, (3) the two Sacraments of the Gospel, (4) the Historic Episcopate, locally adapted in the methods of its administration to the varying needs of the nations and peoples.

In 1920 this took a rather different form. The fourth item was expressed thus: "A ministry acknowledged by every part of the Church as possessing not only the inward call of the Spirit, but also the commission of Christ and the authority of the whole body." The bishops continued: "May we not reasonably claim that the Episcopate is the one means of providing such a ministry?" The generous tone of the 1920 Appeal, which was of course not addressed to non-episcopalians alone, made a great impression upon Nonconformists, but the actual method suggested did not prove acceptable to them. It was as follows:

> "We who send forth this appeal would say that if the authorities of other communions should so desire, we are persuaded that, *terms of union having been otherwise satisfactorily adjusted*,* Bishops and clergy of our Communion would willingly accept from these authorities a form of commission or recognition which would commend our ministry to their congregations, as having its place in the one family life. It is not in our power to know how far this suggestion may be acceptable to those to whom we offer it. We can only say that we offer it in all sincerity as a token of our longing that all ministries of grace, theirs and ours, shall be available for the service of our Lord in a united Church. It is our hope that the same motive would lead ministers who have not received it to accept a commission through episcopal ordination, as obtaining for them a ministry throughout the whole fellowship. In so acting no one of us could possibly be taken to repudiate his past ministry."

Nevertheless, it was felt by Nonconformists to be unequal. In this way. A commission accepted from Nonconformity by bishops and priests would be generally regarded as merely authorizing its recipients to minister in Nonconformist churches. A commission accepted from bishops by Nonconformists might be regarded by its recipients as merely authorizing them to minister in Anglican churches. But such commission would actually consist of the laying on of hands, and would be regarded by very many persons as conveying for the first time Catholic Orders. To many Churchmen, thoroughly accustomed as they are to things which are differently interpreted by different

* Italics ours. The point is of supreme importance. Holy Order is not a sort of virus with which persons can be infected. That would be either mechanical or magical. It must be thought of in relation to some continuous purpose in the life of the Church.

people, it seemed at the time that the admitted ambiguity was not fatal. And the merit of the proposal seemed to be that it made no attempt to determine precisely how much each side would receive from such mutual authorization. It was merely suggested that each side would receive whatever in the sight of God might be necessary for a complete ministry in the United Church. But to Nonconformists it seemed unequal, to involve, if not a denial, at least a questioning of their former ministry, a thing which all Christian Ministers rightly find it very hard to face. Accordingly it was not acceptable. Another way must therefore be found. Between 1920 and 1930 two things had happened. The Lausanne Conference had put out in 1927, in rather more detail than Lambeth, the suggestion that the only possible course was to comprehend in one church the episcopal, the presbyteral and the congregational forms of church order, a policy which has since been adopted by Friends of Reunion, a group which arose in 1933. There had also come into prominence the South India scheme, an actual scheme for uniting (1) the southern dioceses of the Church of India, Burma and Ceylon; (2) the South India United Church, which is composed of various elements; and (3) the South India Methodist Church. It looks as if this scheme will before long come into operation. It involves for us two things over which some heads are shaken. It involves (1) assent to the principle that the fact of episcopacy is adequate basis for union, apart from any specific belief about its nature. This means more than the abolition of prelacy, the re-establishment of constitutional episcopacy. It means that, while the act of episcopal laying on of hands is to be essential to all future ordinations, there is to be no official theory about the nature of the grace of consecration. Some think that this is dangerous, others that the true nature of the grace of consecration will inevitably become manifest and will be admitted by all who are brought into spiritual contact with it. (2) It involves a certain period of irregularity (thirty years), during which all ordinations are to be episcopal, but existing ministers are to carry on within the United Church. There is in this connection what is called the "gentleman's agreement," which is quoted by Dr. Appasamy in page 87 of this issue, an agreement which provides that in no case shall conscience be over-ridden. There are some who feel, and on the other hand some who do not, that the existence of what seems to us an irregularity, given the warrant of an honourable pledge that it will not be made a cause of offence to any Catholic congregation, is not intolerable, provided that it is endured in the cause of reunion, that it steadily decreases, and that it eventually comes to an end.

In this number of THEOLOGY we have two very timely articles on the subject. Dr. Iddings Bell puts forward a powerful statement of the necessity for Œcumenical Reunion, as seen from the stoutly Catholic but not Ultramontane point of view. His paper contains some acute thinking on what may be called the politics of Christendom, and his analysis of contemporary tendencies is important and encouraging. We think that he underestimates the Catholic quality of the mind of many non-episcopalians, but there is one respect in which he may easily be more right, and one in which we ourselves may easily be more wrong, than we suppose. American Protestantism is probably more atomistic, and, where it has to some extent escaped that peril, more prone to the *facilis descensus humanismi* than it is in our own country. Dr. Bell's rather pessimistic diagnosis may therefore be in itself correct. On the other hand, those who take part in inter-denominational conferences, whether they be Anglo-Catholics or Nonconformists, tend to become de-tribalized. Free Churchmen in associations like the Student Movement and Friends of Reunion become more Catholic-minded. Something also happens to Churchmen; they acquire what may be called a diminished or an increased Catholicism, according to the sense in which the word is used. It may be that the conference-attenders are in the van and will eventually lead their Churches in the suggested direction, but they are not very exact representatives. It is important that they should not be swayed by sentiment or by some considerations which are only of the moment, and that they should stiffen themselves by remembering what Dr. Bell and those like him have to say, lest they concede what is not theirs to give. At the same time, Dr. Bell's rather doctrinaire statement (on p. 78), that Protestants may safely be left to the God who made them, must be qualified by the testimony of Dr. Appasamy. It appears that the Protestants have something to contribute, which we need. The Great Church of the future is greater even than Orthodox *plus* Roman *plus* Anglican. The true way is never simple absorption, but always comprehension.

We commend to our readers the Dean of Winchester's *The Story of Winchester Cathedral* (Raphael Tuck, 2s. 6d.). The Dean uses his scholarship to tell a simple and fascinating tale. His purpose is not so much to describe the Cathedral as it is, but to recount its story and the story of its architectural and artistic treasures in relation to the men and the events of history which form its background. It represents exactly the way in which pilgrims and other visitors ought to be conducted over Cathedrals.

The book amply proves the truth of Freeman's words: "There is no spot in all England better worth study or more compact with historical associations." The last chapter describes how, "for five and a half years, Mr. William Walker, wearing a diving costume that weighed 200 lbs., labouring in the dark (since the water was too discoloured to admit of electric light being used), and working by touch instead of sight, was engaged in the work of underpinning." The book is enriched by admirable pictures.

Readers will be interested to learn that the author of the striking paper on "The Worshipful Life" is a student at the College of the Resurrection, Mirfield.

To our great regret, and through no fault of the writer, there were two misprints in Mr. Mascall's review of the "Examination of McTaggart's Philosophy" by C. D. Broad.

P. 47, l. 4. *For* "done" *read* "true."
P. 48, l. 4. *For* "hope" *read* "type."

ŒCUMENICITY

AN ESSAY ON LIBERAL CATHOLICISM AND CHRISTIAN REUNION

(Reprinted by permission of "The Living Church.")

THE problem of how to reunite into one œcumenical Church those who are followers of Jesus, the Incarnate Son of God, is, first of all, complicated by the fact that many who call themselves after His Name seem to overlook the social nature—if you will, the political nature—of the spiritual enterprise He came to set in being. It is a curious thing that this should have been forgotten, especially by Protestants, who set particular store on reading the Bible, for nothing is more plain in Holy Writ than that Jesus preached and worked primarily in terms of a Kingdom; and a Kingdom is a political something, if language has meaning at all.

Men speak much of Jesus Christ; but many apparently forget that the second of these words is not a name but a title. Christ—or Messiah—means the Anointed One, the King. When Jesus came upon the earthly scene, the Jews for a long time had been looking forward to a supernatural monarch, one destined to restore and perfectly to develop the old nationality of their people. They differed in their concept of what the coming King would be like; but they agreed that what they must have, and what God would send them, was a King. Definitely and deliberately, Jesus built upon that hope.

He began His ministry, hailed with Messianic titles by one John the Baptizer; and the message of this John had been that "the Kingdom is at hand."* As soon as Jesus had called His Twelve, He went about Galilee, "preaching the good news of the Kingdom."† His model prayer asked, first of all, for the coming of the Kingdom.‡ He told His followers to "seek first the Kingdom."§ He that is least in the Kingdom is greater than John or any prophet.‖ "It is given to you," He told His pupils, "to know the mysteries of the Kingdom," which the general public could not understand.¶ "Thou art the King," said Peter, making the great confession.** Some standing by should not die till they saw "the Son of Man coming in His Kingdom."†† Joseph of Arimathæa, who claimed the

* St. Matt. iii. 2. † St. Matt. iv. 23. ‡ St. Matt. vi. 10.
§ St. Matt. vi. 33. ‖ St. Matt. xi. 11. ¶ St. Matt. xiii. 11.
** St. Mark. viii. 29. †† St. Matt. xvi. 28.

Lord's body after the Cross, was one who "also waited for the Kingdom."* "Fear not," He reassured His followers, "for it is the Father's good pleasure to give to you the Kingdom."† And again, "I appoint unto you a Kingdom, as My Father hath appointed unto Me, that ye may eat and drink at My table in My Kingdom."‡ "Unless a man be born again," He told Nicodemus, "he cannot enter into the Kingdom."§ After the resurrection, as we read in the Acts, Jesus spent forty days with His Chosen, "speaking of the things pertaining to the Kingdom."‖ And then, at once, went forth His followers, preaching the same. People believed Philip, "preaching the things concerning the Kingdom," and were baptized.¶ Paul "expounded and testified the Kingdom";** and the last scriptural glimpse we get of the great Apostle is as a prisoner in his hired house at Rome, "preaching the Kingdom of God, and teaching those things which concern the Lord Jesus the King."†† The Epistles are full of the same thought; and the Book of the Revelation reaches culmination in the sounding of the seventh trumpet, when "there were great voices in Heaven, saying, The Kingdoms of this world are become of our Lord and of His Anointed, and He shall reign for ever and ever."‡‡ And He who is called *the Logos of God* hath on His vesture and on His thigh written, "King of Kings and Lord of Lords."§§ As a matter of fact, Jesus is called King or receives the Kingly title 388 times in the New Testament.

All these texts have been cited, not because one can prove anything much by proof-texts, but because they are typical, because the whole of the record bears witness to the unmistakable fact that the religion of Jesus is not a religion based on individualistic salvation, but rather one which puts its hope for the individual upon his being absorbed into a Kingdom—the realm of Jesus the King—and losing himself in its advancement.‖‖

This is unmistakable; and yet there are those who have made mistakes about it. Surely, most of contemporary Protestantism seems to know little of all this. Under Protestant guidance, Jesus ceases to be the King of a kingdom and takes on the guise

* St. Mark xv. 43. † St. Luke xii. 32. ‡ St. Luke xxii. 29.
§ St. John iii. 3. ‖ Acts i. 3. ¶ Acts viii. 12.
** Acts xxviii. 23. †† Acts xxviii. 31. ‡‡ Rev. xi. 15.
§§ Rev. xix. 16.

‖‖ The one text about the Kingdom—one among scores—that is capable of an atomistic or subjective interpretation is St. Luke xvii. 21: "Behold, the Kingdom of God is within you." But even that is more so in the English translation than in the Greek. ἐντος is a word which means either "within" or "among"; and Christian commentators from the beginning have, overwhelmingly, interpreted it here in the latter sense, a sense in harmony with the rest of the scriptural references to the Kingdom.

of the great individualist, the gentle friend of each well-meaning man, the homely expounder of a simple morality to be followed, perhaps, if they wish, by people one by one. What of all that Christ Himself kept saying of the nature of His mission? What of Jesus before Pilate, hearing his "Art thou a King, then?" answering, "Thou sayest it"?* What of the ribald taunts of those before the Cross?† What of the title placed over the Cross by Pilate?‡ What of that name first given to Jesus' followers in Antioch, still the name by which they are called everywhere: "Christians"—"the King's men"?§

How did it happen that the idea of the Kingdom became so strangely lost in Protestant circles? There it is in the Bible. It has always been in the Catholic Faith, which has continuously declared that the Church is the Kingdom of Christ—doing His will in Heaven, fighting His battle in earth—in the world but not of the world. Christianity was not to the saints an individualistic matter—not to Paul or Augustine or Francis or any of them, if what they wrote and said and did can be believed. How did it happen that in the sixteenth century many in northwest Europe rapidly forgot all this?‖

It seems to have been due to the atomism and the subjectivism which were characteristic of Renaissance and post-Renaissance thought, especially in its northern form; the atomism which destroyed the idea of the unity of mankind and then attacked even the idea of the nation as organic, or as more than a series of relationships between individuals; and the subjectivism which urged people to look inside themselves for Reality, instead of to a totality almost wholly external to themselves, in which they must lose themselves that they might find themselves. That atomism produced at last an economics of greed which by now has well-nigh ruined us physically; and it has produced, also, that impercipient political theory which makes the modern state the servant of the individuals who are its citizens, and thus tends to incite every man to become an exploiter, or would-be exploiter, of the body-politic. That subjectivism has brought modern men near to madness, with its urge that every human being may properly regard himself as a sort of God. For 300 years we have become more and more atomistic in politics and more and more subjective in philosophy.

Quite naturally, those possessed of such notions have read

* St. Luke xxiii. 3. † St. Matt. xxvii. 29.
‡ St. Mark xv. 26. § Acts xi. 26.
‖ It should not be forgotten that Protestantism was a movement localized to that section of the world, and that it never became influential except there and in the colonies settled by people from that vicinity.

them into their Bibles and into their worship and into their conception of Jesus. More and more, they have thereby created a new religion—both atomistic and subjective—a religion which, whatever may be its merits or demerits, is about as different as it well can be from the Christianity of the first fifteen centuries, from the Christianity of the majority of Christians today, from the Christianity of the Catholic Church, from the Christianity of the Bible.

It is this which has made the problem of Christian reunion, as many good people have envisaged that problem, impossibly difficult. How can there be real union between those who regard themselves as sworn servants of the King, men and women re-born by baptism into that supernatural but perfectly definite Kingdom which is the Church, "called-out" from the world for membership in that Kingdom, on the one hand, and on the other, those who think of Jesus either as a kindly human prophet who spoke goodly words of profound advice to people and lived a helpful and beautiful life long ago (as the Modernist would have it), or else as a Divine Being whose concern is with saving people one by one, whatever that may mean (as the Evangelical Protestant, or the Buchmanite, insists)? How can there be unity between those who regard the Church as a divinely redeemed* and commissioned† organism, a new and greater Israel,‡ a peculiar and priestly community,§ and those who regard a church as a loose and voluntary association of persons of like mind or of a like sort of individual religious experience?

In so far as a Protestant communion still regards itself as a part of the Catholic Church (using those words in their historic meaning), it is possible for Catholics to talk over with it the problem of unity; but where that conception is lacking—as it is with nine-tenths of Protestants today—talk about unity can hardly mean anything that is deeper than sentimentality. Catholics can shew larger regard for Protestants, and maintain their own self-respect far better, if they let alone the problem of the relationship of Protestantism to the rest of Christianity, content to see whether atomism and subjectivism, and the sort of religion which reflects them, are destined to prevail upon the earth. If this were so, Catholicism would be doomed. If not, Protestantism will in time fade away and be as if it never had been. At any rate, to seek reunion between these two incompatibles is to attempt to yoke together horses which pull in widely divergent paths. That makes only for greater friction and less work performed for God.

* St. Titus ii. 14.
† St. John xx. 21-23.
‡ The whole Epistle to the Hebrews.
§ 1 Peter ii. 9.

We Episcopalians ought to know that very well, from experience within our own communion. Despite the fact that our Prayer Book and Church law are definitely Catholic, there is a large part of our body which, because of historical accident, inherited prejudice, and other impacts arousing emotional reactions, insists on holding to Protestant—*i.e.*, atomistic and subjective—ideas. This does not make for peace in the Episcopal Church, or for effectiveness in its labour. We are not thereby assisted in effectively fighting the King's battles. Of all communions, it would almost seem, we are the least equipped, in these days, to lead in efforts toward the reunion of Christendom. We do not, though it has often been said, in fact occupy a *via media* between Catholicism and Protestantism. There is no such *via media*. Our Catholic brethren are offended by our many lay people with Protestant bias, and by our few, but more vocal, priests who insist they are not priests but only Protestant ministers. Our Protestant brethren, attracted by these same persons, are equally offended when they look more closely at us and discover that we are really Catholic in our *geist* and in our polity and in our worship. We are not, on investigation, as atomistic or as subjective as too friendly ambassadors would have had them believe. Quite understandably that makes everybody more than a little unhappy, for a Catholic or an Orthodox or a Protestant knows well enough that Protestantism and Catholicism are not phases of the same thing. Only Anglicans are ever possessed by that curious delusion. The immediate task of Anglicanism is not so much to heal this world-wide breach, but rather to digest, first of all, its own internal differences.

The Catholic in our Church may well be content to let time cure these internecine conflicts. He need not strive or cry, for the simple but adequate reason that time works toward solving the problem in the Catholic's way. Not merely are the Episcopal Church's formularies on his side; the movements of modern life and thought daily increase his influence.

First of all, the atomistic way of looking on life grows more and more intolerable in every aspect of man's activity. Individualistic economics, the scheme of *laissez faire*, has reduced us to near starvation in the midst of plenty. Even in America, the most individualistic country in the world, we are revolting against it. The democratic theory of the state, which makes it the servant and the citizen the served, has nowadays as its apologists for the most part old, old men—and many of them are disquieted about it. Youth is tired of a world which sees no greater entity, in realms economic or political, than a single human being; and middle age, the men and women of practical

experience and acquired sagacity and established probity, is almost equally impatient. In Russia and Germany and Turkey and Austria and Italy, the revolt against atomism and an atomistic democracy has become so strong that even reasonable liberties, even sacred rights, have temporarily been abrogated, with the consent both of the common people and of intellectuals, that a greater and more basic unity may manifest itself. Even in our own country, invasions of what has long been deemed a sacred realm of individual freedom are applauded, under the present administration, which would have made men shout "Treason!" in the recent days of, say, the older Roosevelt. There would seem to be a new recognition that there are such things as America and an American destiny, not merely a lot of atomistic individuals called Americans.

Nationalism has its dangers, some of them grave; but it seems to increasing crowds of people (not the least intelligent) to be less objectionable, more tolerable, than individualism. Perhaps out of it may come a conception of internationalism which is less sentimental than those which we have seen of late—a new sense of Empire.

At any rate, the trend of secular thought goes daily more and more against that theory about man and society which, in realms religious, produced Protestantism.

Still another feature of thought today which militates against Protestantism is the general unwillingness, rapidly growing in intensity, to be satisfied with contemporaneity, an insistence upon resting that which is and is to be upon that which has been: the revolt against the provincialism of the present. This may be seen in most of the new political movements, particularly in Fascism. It is also apparent in the arts, in all of which the eccentricities of yesterday seem dated with a completeness that is startling. That which is new must have its roots in that which has been. We Americans may find it harder to realize that this is so than people overseas. In our country, we have been attempting to fuse the cultures of the world by destroying them in the melting pot of our colonial English civilization. The pot was always frail, for the settlers of this country in the beginning were of varied nations, and more concerned from the start in expansion than in tradition. At any rate, the pot has been melted up with the contents. To change the simile, we are a rootless people. But this cannot go on. We must have a past, or there will be no sane future. That past will turn out to be, in the end, the old tradition of European culture. We are of a piece with the rest of mankind. More and more we, too, with respect, rediscover the days that were, the days that give meaning to the present and the future.

All this is bound to be reflected in religion. As that occurs, Catholicism, with its appeal to age-long spiritual experience, is bound to have the advantage over Protestantism, which has always been, and increasingly has become, absorbed with too great exclusiveness in the present; which has always ignored and frequently scorned the wisdom of the ancient world.

As for the revolt in our philosophy against subjectivism, it is so well known as to need no comment, while our rightly esteemed psychological therapeutics are mostly based on an assumption that the introvert is diseased and dangerous. What, then, shall happen to an introspective piety ?

Yes, time works against the type of thinking and action to which Protestantism, in religion, gives expression. An objective and corporate Christianity is more in accord with the way men's minds do move today, and apparently this will be even more true tomorrow. The Catholic can afford to be patient. Even those in the Anglican communion who are most inclined to be Protestant-minded cannot long resist that trend of thought which moves toward the correction of post-Renaissance mistakes in thought. Even today, the more emphatic proponents of a determined Protestantism among us sound a bit like voices from the tomb.

And while this goes on in Anglicanism, Protestantism elsewhere seems even more on the wane. In America, where thought patterns are still behind those of Europe (we have been more given to material expansion than to thought), this is not as apparent as it is in other lands. Take Holland, for instance, once a strong Protestant country. The Protestant churches hold handfuls of people. Meanwhile, the Catholic population of Rotterdam alone is half that of the city. It has grown tenfold in sixty years. Except for Barth and his few followers, continental Protestant thought is sterile, and popular indifference to it marked. Meanwhile, in Italy, in France, in Germany, Catholic letters, art, philosophy, all flourish. Even in America, it is only in the hinterlands that the older Protestantism is at all respected. Anong the leaders and in the metropolises we have, on the left, those Protestants who, in despair about Protestantism's future, move ever toward a more or less thinly disguised humanism that can call itself Christian only by a neologism, while a few on the right, far-seeing, return daily to a more than sympathy for Catholic theology, Catholic worship, the idea of a Catholic Church. The centre is without any leadership to speak of. The brains of American Protestantism are no longer, in any real sense, Protestant.

It seems, to many of us, in view of all this, that the problem of reunion, the problem of restoring the œcumenicity, the world-

wideness, of the Church, is not any longer—indeed, that it never was—one of attempting to reunite Catholicism and Protestantism. It is now—indeed, it always has been—a problem of reuniting Catholicism. Protestantism may safely be left to time and the loving-kindness of One who can understand and lead those who, carried along by a world which made the individualistic mistake in many fields of life and thought, made it also in religion.

Catholic Christendom is made up of three great subdivisions. There are those who are in obedience to the Bishop of Rome as the Infallible Vicar of the King; there is the Orthodox East, which rejects such obedience; and there are Anglicans, who also reject it. (Old Catholics and some others there are, also; but though they are worthy of respect, they are not important in considering œcumenicity, since if the other breaches were healed, they would be taken care of in the process.) None of these three groups is in formal communion with the others, although there is close affinity between the latter two. This schism divides the Kingdom and reduces its combatant effectiveness. It hampers the King. Therefore it has the nature of sin. It is obviously the duty of all Catholics to repent of this schism and to pray that it may be healed. This can never be, however, until we perceive what has produced it and what perpetuates it (which may not be the same thing). Such understanding is exceedingly difficult at which to arrive; and reunion will apparently, in consequence, be slow in coming, as men judge slowness. To God, with whom time is not an inherent concept, the delay in restoring unity may not seem so grave a matter as it does to men. *The desire to diagnose the difficulty, and loving-kindness between the differing protagonists, must mean more than speed to Him who is the King.* And possibly events may impel us toward reunion much faster than now seems possible. We may pray that it shall be so.

To say that the great stumbling-block to reunion is the Roman papacy is not enough. One must perceive what has transformed the papal claim from that of being *princeps inter pares* among the bishops of Christendom (to which no one but a person blinded by historic prejudice has objection) to the very different thing that it now is.

It is fair to say that modern papal theory is the most harmful result of the Reformation. It is not difficult for anyone with a modicum of historical imagination to understand what happened in the Roman Church as a result of that catastrophe. A large part of the civilized world was not so much bent on rejecting papal claims, nor intent on rectifying ecclesiastical abuses, but rather seemed to be abandoning the very idea of the

Church itself, the concept of the united Kingdom of God sent to teach in the King's name and to fight His battles. Granted that Renaissance corruption in the Church had become intolerable. Even the Roman apologists admit it nowadays. The remedy that was being adopted seemed to Rome more intolerable still. It involved dismemberment of the Body itself. Its atomist and subjective emphases seemed as wrong, as ruinous to life and thought, to the Roman Church then, as now they seem to many more than are within that Church. Something apparently had to be devised to protect what was left—to insure the teaching of the faith as it had emerged from the past, to prevent the breaking up of the Kingdom on earth into an anarchy. The Ultramontanists, driven by a fear near to despair, saw in the See of Peter the only possible centre of safety and the only available security for the preservation of Christ's intention. Rapidly, an extreme integration came into being, and with it theory that was the result of assumed necessity, until in 1870 the Pope of Rome was declared to be infallible, in himself, when defining matters of faith and morals. And today Rome insists that the only path to Catholic unity is by way of complete submission to the Holy Roman Catholic Church, infallible papacy included, with all that that involves in attitude and temper.

The Orthodox East may be pardoned for not seeing things that way. The cleavage between East and West is an old one, long antedating the Reformation. It was due in the beginning partly to cultural differences and partly to variant political complications. The East was old in culture when the West, absorbed in assimilating and civilizing the barbarian invaders, was young and crude. Rome backed the new Teutonic Empire; the East was allied to the Empire of Constantinople. Rome looked forward; the East looked back. The cleavage came, but it was not unhealable. Then came the Western Reformation. Its pressures were unknown to the Orthodox churches. Those pressures accentuated papal claims to a degree that the East considered, and still considers, as unreasonable as they are unhistorical. The decree of infallibility seems to the East, which has not shared the travail which produced it, both unnecessary and absurd. The Orthodox believe that the Spirit-guided community, the Church, is in its collective capacity infallible. God will not let it go wholly wrong. But it does not need a single voice which can infallibly direct it at any given moment. The East considers the claim that one man is infallible to be as atomistic a notion as any ever conceived by the most extreme of Protestants.

In this, the Anglican Catholic Church concurs. Its Reforma-

tion differed from those on the Continent. It consisted not in an atomistic affirmation but in an assertion that, abuses in Christendom having become what they were, they must at once be cleaned up. And, inasmuch as the papacy of the moment seemed hardly on the side of the angels, it was no time to pay heed to papal interference. But the English reformers had no intention of departing from the Catholic Church. Upon the basis they devised, the Anglican Church has continued to work, despite Henry VIII's greed, Elizabeth's unprincipled statecraft, Erastian corruption in the later years, or mighty pressures from continental Protestants. Those pressures were, indeed, so great that the common people of England well-nigh lost their Catholic consciousness. Most of them are still without it. But the Church remained what the Reformers had made it—Catholic but not papal. And with the coming and growth of the "Oxford Movement," so called, since 1833, Anglicans have seen an increasing popular rediscovery of their heritage, a rediscovery which grows apace with every passing year.

In that experience—none is more strange or romantic in the history of any part of Christendom—Anglicanism has learned, or thinks it has, the unwisdom of the concentration, regularization, and rigidity which are involved in the modern Roman papal position. It has learned not to be afraid of scholarship, Biblical or theological. It has learned to regard science as no antagonist to religion. It has learned the advantage of freedom in liturgical expression. It has learned that a man can be a good Catholic without being protected by an *Index* from anti-Catholic argument. It has learned to distrust, for the preservation of the Kingdom, that *geist*—that temper of mind—which urged on the Ultramontanism that resulted in the Vatican decree of papal infallibility.

Anglicans have a feeling that Roman Catholics will learn all that, too, in time. The very fact that, since 1871, the Pope has not ventured a word of allegedly infallible utterance is evidential. Cardinal Newman thought that the decree was too sweeping, and certain later on to be modified;* and many Roman Catholics say the same today, though unhappily not as openly as he did. The peak of Ultramontanism seems definitely to have been passed. But until much water has flowed under many Roman bridges, the "papal infallibility" will bar reunion between Roman Catholics on the one hand and the Orthodox and Anglicans on the other. All the other difficulties could, probably, be resolved without too great effort. Most of the old causes of friction between East and West now operate no more.

* See the Cardinal's letter to Miss Holmes, May 15, 1871, quoted *in extenso* in the official *Life*, by Wilfrid Ward (ed. 1913, vol. ii., p. 379).

The abuses which the English Church demanded be rectified, and had to withdraw from the Roman obedience to get corrected, are most of them no more to be seen in Rome. Modern Roman Catholicism is in most respects a beautiful expression of Catholic religious life. It is only the *new* abuse which hinders all Catholics becoming one again, one Kingdom, unriven, round the whole great world of men—the host composed of them who live and work within the Kingdom, for the King. And in that reunited Church there seems no reason to doubt that the Bishop of that old imperial city which is the fountain of our culture may and should be acknowledged the chief patriarch.

Meanwhile, until the barrier raised by modern accretions to the ancient Roman primacy is done away, what is the liberal Catholic to do on behalf of unity? Certainly not make his immediate and individual submission to the Pope! He cannot do that in complete honesty if he holds conviction of his present Catholic life, or as long as he disbelieves in the historicity or the common-sense of a one-man infallibility. If he "goes to Rome," as things now are, he must deny that he has ever received a valid sacrament or, if he be a priest, that he has ever offered the Holy Sacrifice or given communion to the faithful. One cannot do that. And he must acknowledge too, specifically, the papal inerrancy when speaking *ex cathedra* on faith and morals, with all that that involves of distrust of free research and thought, and of the effective guidance of the chosen community by the Holy Spirit. His contribution to Catholic reunion must, of necessity, lie elsewhere.

It lies in making his own communion as truly and beautifully Catholic in reality as it is already in theory and in potential fact. If he can do that—if, altogether, liberal Catholics can shew even to Rome that Catholicism and papal concentration are not necessarily inseparable—much may be done to soften Roman rigour, until that communion shall so modify her definitions as to remove the dreadful bar she has erected. That bar she built wherewith to protect the Kingdom from Protestant disintegration; but with it now, in fact, she makes impossible the Catholic unity for which the King so earnestly prayed that night before He went to die that the Kingdom might be. And in that proper task of ours, the Orthodox must share as well. We cannot by force of argument draw down the Roman Catholics from their modern citadel. But we can surely at length *win* them to a nobler charity and to a more historic polity, win them by love long manifest and Catholic holiness made plain. It is in our own communion that our chiefest duty lies.

We must not strive to have reunion, we Catholics, in order that we may the better love the King. The centre of unity is in

Him, not in us. We must the better love the King, we Catholics, and then reunion will come, come in His way, not ours. And when it does come, then, again, once more "the good news of the Kingdom shall be proclaimed as by a herald in the whole inhabited world to all the nations for an affirmation,"* for the healing of the bitterness of men.

BERNARD IDDINGS BELL.

RECENT CHANGES IN THE SOUTH INDIA SCHEME

IN 1933 a new edition of the *Proposed Scheme of Union* was published with a considerable amount of new matter. Since then the Episcopal Synod and the Standing Committee of the General Council of the Church of India, Burma and Ceylon, the General Assembly of the South India United Church and the Provincial Synod of the Methodist Church have met. They have been examining carefully the new edition of the *Proposed Scheme of Union* and have brought forward various amendments for the consideration of the Joint Committee. A meeting of the Joint Committee was held in Madras from February 13th to 17th to consider these amendments. Almost all the forty-five members of the Committee were present.† There was also present Dr. W. F. Lofthouse, an ex-President of the Methodist Conference in England. He was sent to investigate on the spot the proposals for Church Union in South India, and to report to the Methodist Conference. He followed the proceedings of the Committee with great care and interest. At different times his opinion was called for, and whatever he had to say was listened to with considerable respect. I have space here to deal only with the outstanding questions which the Committee took up.

THE MEANING OF EPISCOPACY

In the *Proposed Scheme of Union*, 1933, the paragraph on the episcopate read thus: "The uniting Churches accept the historic episcopate in a constitutional form as part of their basis of union; but this acceptance does not bind the united Church to any particular theory concerning episcopacy or concerning orders of the ministry. Further, the uniting Churches do not intend that the Church after union should require the acceptance of any such theory as a necessary quali-

* St. Matt. xxiv. 14.

† There is now a revised (1934) edition of the scheme. Page numbers in brackets refer to it.—ED.

fication for its ministry, or make it a determining factor in its relations with other Churches."* With a view to making clear their own position the S.I.U.C. had put in a note thus:

"In accepting the term 'historic' episcopate as used in the Basis of Union and the Constitution together with its qualifying clauses, the South India United Church wishes to record its attitude with great clearness, both for itself and for all others concerned. In accepting, for the sake of union, the 'historic' episcopate as found in the Anglican and other Churches, it understands by this term that for many centuries episcopacy has been a form of government that has persisted in the Church, and is in that sense entitled to be described as 'historic.'"*

It has been felt that the meaning of the paragraph is not quite clear. It has also been felt that it is not desirable to put in the Basis of Union, which will probably become an historic document setting forth the primary principles on which the three Churches come together, a note like this. The Joint Committee therefore suggested that both the paragraph and the note should be replaced by the following new paragraph:

"The uniting Churches accept the historic episcopate in a constitutional form as part of their Basis of Union. There are within the uniting Churches differing views and beliefs about episcopacy which have been frankly recognized throughout the negotiations. For example, some regard episcopacy merely as a form of Church government which has persisted in the Church through the centuries, and may as such be called historic, and which at the present time is expedient for the Church in South India. Others believe that episcopacy is of divine appointment, and that episcopal ordination is an essential guarantee of the sacraments of the Church. Some again hold various views intermediate between these two. The acceptance of episcopacy by the uniting Churches, thus differing in their views and beliefs concerning it and concerning orders of the ministry, is not to be taken as committing the united Church to the acceptance of any particular interpretation of episcopacy, and no such particular interpretation shall be demanded from any minister or member of the united Church." [Pp. 7, 8.]

This probably will now satisfy all the different schools of thought.

THE VALUE OF THE MINISTRIES

In the S.I.U.C. there has always been an extreme section which has not looked with favour on the Scheme. Before the General Assembly met, one out of the eight Councils composing

* *Proposed Scheme of Union*, p. 7.

the S.I.U.C. had definitely voted the Scheme down. Another Council had asked earnestly for an expression of the spiritual equality of the three ministries in the United Church. The General Assembly therefore asked that in the Scheme somewhere a recognition of the spiritual equality of the ministries should be made. They pointed out that their ministry had been effective spiritually, and that it was necessary for the various uniting Churches to acknowledge that God, indeed, had blessed their ministry just as much as He had blessed the episcopal ministry. The Joint Committee took the line that it was not desirable to use the word "equality," for it is not possible for men to pronounce on the equality or otherwise of the different ministries. But it is possible for us to say, and to say clearly, that the ministries of the Free Churches have been owned of God. The Joint Committee has suggested that in the Basis of Union, Section I, after the first sentence on page 2, the following be inserted: "The uniting Churches gratefully acknowledge the grace of God abundantly manifested in each other's ministries and the spiritual efficacy of these ministries in the work of the Kingdom of God, and they thank God for the blessings He has given to the world through them. They confidently expect that He will bestow even greater blessings when these ministries, hitherto separate, are working together in one fellowship."

The Joint Committee has also suggested that in the Basis of Union, Section II, p. 8, the section begins as follows: "Acknowledging that the grace of God has been clearly manifested in all the ministries of the uniting Churches in their separation, and recognizing that the work of those ministries has been owned by God, the uniting Churches agree that all the ministers working in those Churches at the time of the inauguration of the Union shall be accepted as constituting the initial ministry of the uniting Church." [P. 9.] The work of the Free Churches in South India has been abundantly blessed of God. Numerous strong Churches have sprung up. Even today, in the mass movement area, the Methodists are having large accessions of converts. The Joint Committee has felt that in drafting the above paragraph they were not going beyond the words in the *Lambeth Conference Report*, 1930. "In laying this emphasis on our own inheritance, we emphatically declare that we do not call in question the spiritual reality of the ministries now exercised in non-episcopal Communions. On the contrary we reiterate the declaration of the Lambeth Conference of 1920, that 'These ministries have been manifestly blessed and owned by the Holy Spirit as effective means of grace.'"*

* *Lambeth Conference*, 1930, p. 116.

THE PLEDGE

During the thirty years immediately following the inauguration of the Union, difficult questions may arise. According to the Scheme all the ministers in the united Church, whether episcopally ordained or otherwise, will have the same status during the thirty years. Some congregations and some individuals may have strong convictions about the episcopal ministry. They may not want to be ministered to by a non-episcopally ordained minister. Obviously they should not be forced to go against their conscience. The Joint Committee has said that the three Churches should pledge themselves to a "gentleman's agreement," not to force on those who object any beliefs or traditions. This is the pledge:

"The uniting Churches recognize that the act of union will initiate a process of growing together into one life and of advance towards complete spiritual unity. One essential condition of the attainment of such complete unity is that all the members of the united Church should be willing and able to receive Communion equally in all of its Churches, and it is the resolve of the uniting Churches to do all in their power to that end.

"But they are convinced that this can only take place on the basis of freedom of opinion on debatable matters, and respect for even large differences of opinion and practice such as exist at present, for example, with regard to forms of worship or the conditions regarded as necessary for the valid celebration of Holy Communion. They believe that this freedom and mutual respect can be safeguarded not by the framing of detailed regulations but by assurances given and received in a spirit of confidence and love.

"They therefore pledge themselves and fully trust each other that the united Church will at all times be careful not to allow any over-riding of conscience either by Church authorities or by majorities, and that it will not in any of its administrative acts knowingly transgress the long-established traditions of any of the Churches from which it has been formed. Neither forms of worship or ritual, nor a ministry, to which they have not been accustomed or to which they conscientiously object, will be imposed upon any congregation; and no arrangements with regard to these matters will knowingly be made, either generally or in particular cases, which would either offend the conscientious convictions of persons directly concerned, or which would hinder the development of complete unity within the united Church or imperil its progress towards union with other Churches."*

* *Proposed Scheme of Union*, pp. 14, 15 [16].

What exactly is the meaning of this pledge? The Episcopal Synod and the Standing Committee of the General Council of the Church of India, Burma and Ceylon, in its session held at Calcutta, January 29th to February 2nd, 1933, put out the following interpretation of the pledge: "It is recognized that our delegates have secured, by the rewording adopted, that the implicit intentions of the pledge have been made explicit, and that in that agreement all the uniting Churches have definitely agreed that in its application to the Anglican Church every honest endeavour shall be made that to no former Anglican congregation shall a non-episcopal minister be appointed or be sent for occasional celebrations of the Holy Communion, and that opportunities for securing the ministrations of episcopally ordained clergy will not, because of the Union, be withdrawn from any congregation which now enjoys such ministrations, and further that while no coercion can be applied to individual members of the Church, our clergy, who have entered the united Church, shall have full liberty to continue to instruct their people in accordance with those principles, which they have received, in so far as they do not conflict with the governing principles of the united Church."

This interpretation has called forth a great deal of controversy. The Free Church representatives were very troubled about it. They said that while they had always understood that no individual or congregation in the united Church will be forced to go against his or its conviction, the Anglican dioceses as a whole will throw themselves heart and soul into the new Church. It looks from this interpretation as if the Anglican dioceses will remain aloof from the other Churches even after the Union. They will have episcopally ordained ministers only, even if some congregations desire otherwise, and their people will not receive Communion from non-episcopally ordained ministers. The Joint Committee felt that they could not change the wording of the pledge which had been reached after much discussion. But they issued the following interpretation of the pledge: "In view of questions which have arisen, the Joint Committee thinks it right to state what is in its judgment the meaning of the provisions generally referred to as the pledge.

"This pledge applies to the period following the inauguration of the union when the members of the three Churches, then united in one Church, will be growing together; and the uniting Churches pledge themselves to do all in their power to assist the united Church in its advance towards complete spiritual unity and towards the time when all the members of the united Church will be willing and able to receive Communion equally in all its churches.

"Further, they pledge themselves that because of the union no congregation shall be deprived of forms of worship or a ministry to which it has been accustomed, but every honest endeavour will be made by the authorities of the united Church that neither forms of worship or ritual, nor a ministry, to which they have not been accustomed, or to which they conscientiously object, shall be imposed upon any congregation. *But the Committee does not understand the pledge to imply that the fact that a minister has previously been a minister of either an episcopal or a non-episcopal Church will in itself debar him from appointment to or working in any congregation of the united Church where that congregation desires it.* (*Italics mine.*)

"Further, the intention of the uniting Churches is that there shall be no infringement of the liberty of conscience which every worshipper and every minister now enjoys, and that in the united Church all alike shall be free to worship and to teach according to their conscience, only so that nothing be done to break the fundamental unity of the Church.

"The Joint Committee wishes further to urge upon the negotiating Churches that while the purpose for which these provisions have been inserted in the Basis of Union will not be fulfilled unless the real scope and effect of the pledge be understood by all parties, that purpose will be entirely defeated if detailed interpretations of the pledge and precise statements of its application to particular future and hypothetical cases are demanded, and it appeals to the negotiating Churches to act in this matter in the full spirit of the declaration that freedom of opinion on debatable matters and mutual respect for differences of opinion and practice can be safeguarded not by the framing of detailed regulations but by assurances given and received in a spirit of confidence and love."

Let us try to picture what is likely to happen during the first thirty years. There will be a great deal of enthusiasm, and every one will be keen on peace and harmony in the new Church. Adjustments will be made with due regard to the beliefs and traditions of the congregations. Year by year the number of non-episcopall yord ainedministers will decrease and the number of episcopally ordained ministers will increase. I have also reason to believe that a certain number of Free Church ministers will offer themselves for episcopal ordination in order to expedite the growth in unity. The cases in which the pledge will have to be applied may not be as many as we now imagine.

PRESBYTERS AND THE CONSECRATION OF BISHOPS

In the *Proposed Scheme of Union*, published in 1933, it was stated that "in view of the common desire to carry over from the uniting Churches into the Church of South India all elements which may in any way contribute to the fullest expression of truths which have been valued in the Christian Church, any diocese may provide that representative presbyters of the diocese should join with the Bishops in the laying on of hands at the consecration of its Bishop. It shall always be remembered and taught that, in all consecrations, the true Consecrator is God to whom prayer is made."

This has not proved acceptable to the S.I.U.C. and the Methodist Churches. Their representatives brought up the question again before the Joint Committee, and insisted that it should be the *general rule* of the Church that along with the bishops the presbyters should lay their hands on new bishops. It was pointed out that this would be distinctly going against the Anglican tradition. The Dornakal Diocesan Council has already expressed its view that it does not want presbyters to take part in the consecration of its bishops. The same would most probably be true of the other South Indian Anglican Dioceses. The Joint Committee has therefore decided to close section 10, paragraph 4, on page 26, with the fifth line, and to add the following two paragraphs:

"The Church of South India believes that in all consecrations of bishops and ordination of presbyters, the true Consecrator and Ordainer is God who, in response to the prayers of His Church, and through the words and acts of its representatives, commissions and empowers for the office and work to which they are called the persons whom it has selected.

"In the service of consecration of a bishop in the Church of South India, the person to be consecrated shall be solemnly presented to the bishops who are taking part in the consecration by two presbyters of the diocese to which he is appointed, and these two presbyters shall join with the bishops in the laying on of hands. If, however, the Diocesan Council concerned specially so determine, hands shall be laid on by the bishops only." [P. 27.]

The advice of the Lambeth Conference, 1930, on this point should be recalled: "We hold that the participation by presbyters in the laying on of hands could not, in any way, affect the validity of the consecration, provided, of course, that three Bishops take part in the laying on of hands; but we prefer that it be not adopted lest it should tend to confusion, and we would

urge that, if it be adopted, care should be taken to make it plain that the presbyters do not take part as consecrators."*

It will be seen that the Lambeth Conference does not reject the proposal, though it does not view it with much favour. Another point to be remembered is that this practice of presbyters taking part in the consecration of bishops is in force in the Church of Sweden with which we are in communion.

VOTING BY HOUSES

Our Church has never been happy about the position which has been assigned to the bishops with regard to matters of faith and order. According to the present Scheme, when any matters concerning faith and order are brought up they shall be discussed in the Synod; but the bishops have the power to decide whether or not any proposition should be brought up before the Synod for final voting. The bishops have also the power to determine the particular form in which the proposition could be discussed. This cumbrous proposal has not satisfied either our Church or the Free Churches. It has been suggested that the procedure of voting by Houses which is now followed in our Church might prove to be an adequate solution of the problem. The Free Church delegates asked in the Joint Committee what exactly voting by Houses meant. They were under the impression that the different Houses met by themselves and voted separately. It was made clear that this was not the procedure of voting by Houses. Propositions concerning faith and order would be discussed by the whole Synod. Then, if there is a demand from at least ten members of the Synod that the voting of the proposition shall be by Houses, the votes of the bishops, the presbyters and the laymen shall be counted separately, all voting in the same place. The proposition shall be declared carried only when it is approved by a majority in each of the three groups. This gives equal power and opportunity to each of the three groups to block any undesirable or hasty legislation. The bishops as a group will have an effective voice. A statement of this method will be circulated among the different Churches, and their considered opinion will be called for. The Free Church delegates thought that their Churches would accept this proposal so understood.

CONCLUSION

I should like now to make a few remarks to the Anglo-Catholic friends who are critical of the Scheme.

1. There are, no doubt, in the Scheme certain arrangements

* *Lambeth Conference*, 1930, p. 129.

such as those proposed for the interim period which may not meet with their approval. But with strong feeling on either side it has not been possible after the most friendly negotiations for the last fourteen years to go beyond these principles. To press for more at this stage would be only to wreck the Scheme and to postpone the movement for unity perhaps for another two or three generations.

2. This Scheme has now been before the public for five years. All its principles have been most carefully discussed. In 1930 the Lambeth Conference definitely asked the Church of India, Burma and Ceylon to proceed with the negotiations along the lines laid down. The General Council has also given its general approval. When such a controversial matter as the delegates to the Joint Committee receiving Communion from non-episcopally ordained ministers came up, the overwhelming majority of the bishops of the Province passed a resolution which has made it possible for the delegates to receive Communion if they are so inclined. What exactly is the force of the decisions which these three responsible and authoritative bodies, the Lambeth Conference, the General Council and the Episcopal Synod of the Province, have reached? The only conclusion which any impartial observer can draw is that the authorities of the Church as a whole, after most careful consideration, are in favour of the Scheme, but that a small, though very influential, section of the Church is still working vigorously against what the responsible authorities have decided.

3. The four Dioceses in South India which are negotiating union have come of age. They are now asking for freedom to carry on a spiritual experiment. It is most unwise to deny this freedom. No father can deny freedom to a son who has attained age. He may be very keen about certain things which the son should not do. But to deny freedom and to keep the son under tutelage even with the best of motives serves no useful purpose whatsoever.

4. The Anglo-Catholic has a great contribution to make to the United Church of South India. His sense of history, his rich devotional life, his love of beauty in worship, his understanding of the ascetic ideal and many other values for which he stands are badly needed for the new Church in South India. We are very anxious that these values for which the Anglo-Catholic stands should be preserved in the new Church in some form or other. We therefore hope that, instead of working against the Scheme, the Anglo-Catholics will find it possible to throw themselves wholly into these proposals and to instil their spirit into the new Church. The temperament of the Indian is naturally inclined to a great many of the traditions

and beliefs for which the Anglo-Catholics stand. But how can the Indian temperament express itself if it is held in bondage?

A. J. APPASAMY.

THE RESTORATION OF THE WORSHIPFUL LIFE*

THE object of this conference is to find the common ground of the social and devotional policies of the Catholic Church both in theory and in practice. In seeking to achieve this end, it has rightly sought to discover the relevance of the Catholic Liturgy to the question. To those who know and love and try to understand the Liturgy of our Church this cannot be called enough—the Liturgy is not only relevant, it is fundamental to a Catholic Sociology.

We are here to study Catholic Social Action, but we shall never be able to call any social action truly Catholic until we realize that, like any other active function of the Church Universal, it must draw its origin and its vitality from that *opus Dei* par excellence, the Liturgy of the Catholic Church. It is, in fact, the normal extension and practical expression of the Liturgy.

This paper is a humble attempt to point out again what has been so much more ably pointed out many times before—namely, the power of the life-giving and healing garment of God, the Liturgy, properly approached and understood, to reawaken in the souls of Christian men and women the awful responsibility for their fellows, baptized or not yet baptized, which the privilege of common adoption into the Divine Society of the Catholic Church lays upon each one of them.

A better understanding of the Liturgy is necessary in order that we may use it to produce all its fruits both in individual souls and in society as a whole. The immediate need is to establish such an understanding among the clergy, that they may use it to weld their congregations of individuals into homogeneous Churches—bodies with a strong cohesion ready to challenge the world corporately, acting as members of one supernatural whole, rebuking by its very existence the disunity of modern society.

To bring about such an understanding we must make clear what we mean by the spirit of the Liturgy. It is not merely an agglomeration of services, sacraments and ceremonies, but Christ Himself acting through these visible signs. There is a heresy bred of sacramentalism and ritualism, and of that

* A Paper read at a "Christendom" Conference.

heresy the modern Church is in grave danger. It is Christ, not His material sign, which must come first, for the sign is nothing apart from the *Significatum*. Those Catholics of today who worship the sign and forget the *Significatum* which, or rather Who, is Divine should attempt to recapture the spirit of the Early Church. By the Fathers there were made no elaborate attempts at defining the mode of the Real Presence. They believed pre-eminently in that Divine Reality transcending, and far greater than, its material sign.

The Catholic Sociologist is one who sees that man-made efforts to solve the social problems of the modern world, however self-sacrificing and heroic they may be, are bound to fail. They carry within themselves the seeds of their own corruption for the simple reason that what is man-made can and will be man-destroyed.

Only a referendum beyond the material to the spiritual can clear away the shifting sands, and find the bed-rock on which the edifice of the Catholic Social Order can be built. The imposition of economic law from without is worthless (and we must boldly proclaim it to the world from the housetops), unless it be accompanied by the working of the Spirit from within. This paper is to attempt to shew us the Church as the moral educator of mankind, working by its Sacraments through the channels of its Liturgy to prepare the ground for the seed which grows secretly. In so doing she proves the words of her Divine Founder, who taught that the Kingdom of God is within us, and she justifies the boast of St. Paul, who claimed that the supernatural grace of Christian charity "never faileth"; she goes forward in the confidence that the Kingdom of God, the perfect social order, can and will be established upon earth, because she can do all things through Christ which strengtheneth her.

The secret of such a power and the guarantee of such a boast is to be found in the essential corporateness of the Church; the outward and visible harmony of mankind is only a quixotic vision unless it be based on the inward and mystical conception of the Body of Christ. As far as the waters of baptism spread, men and women are gathered in to a new relationship with God, the adoption of sonship, and from the doctrine of the Fatherhood of God (and from that doctrine alone) there follows that second doctrine, upon which a Catholic Sociology relies—namely, the brotherhood of man. In abandoning his fellows, the Christian man abandons his God, "for inasmuch as ye did it not unto the least of these, ye did it not to me. And these shall go away into eternal punishment."

The supernatural charity, which is the principle of cohesion

whereby the Divine Society is bound together, proceeds from the Godhead Himself, "from which all the body by joints and bands having nourishment ministered, and knit together, increaseth with the increase of God."

To make this possible the Liturgy of the Church is essential, and to galvanize Catholic Social Action into action indeed, it must be the first business of the Catholic priest to make his people see and understand the true significance of that Liturgy which binds them both together, to make them put Christ first as Christ using material things, to see the purpose in creation. The Spirit of the Liturgy is opposed to Protestantism and all so-called purely spiritual religion which dispenses with signs and externals, and it is equally opposed to that ritualism which lays undue stress on them. The Liturgy is Christ gathering His people together and binding them into one organic whole for the establishment of His Kingdom.

One of the most beautiful, the most reasoned and most forceful expressions of the social consciousness of the Catholic Church is perhaps Mr. G. K. Chesterton's hymn, "O God of earth and altar." This, better than anything else I know, gives an example of how the worshipful life, rightly developed, turns out from itself to seek the salvation of all men as one organic whole and not as isolated individuals:

Tie in a living tether
The prince and priest and thrall,
Bind all our lives together,
Smite us and save us all.

The "living tether" is the Liturgy of the Catholic Church, "earth and altar" appear as correlative terms; the religious individualism which characterized both Reformation and Counter-reformation was separating the Church from society, the spiritual from the secular, was sundering the gift from the altar which sanctifieth the gift; it was undermining the foundations of society which are spiritual; and we of the twentieth century are left to survey the inevitable result.

When the Catholic talks of the spiritual basis of society, and seeks to solve the world's social problem by fostering the spiritual and worshipful motive, he is not talking of the other-worldliness of that subjective and ecstatic mysticism which is ever on the verge of oriental pantheism. He refers to the Church mysticism of the Fathers, the coming of God among men, the sanctification, the deification (if the term is not too bold) of the human race from above, not the absorption of the contemplative into the Absolute. There is a subtle and yet fundamental distinction between the easy way of the pantheist

who proclaims that "All is God" and the bold battle-cry of the Catholic that "God is all."

Something objective, a vital and a terrible force, is necessary to transform the hopeless despair of the present world order into a joyful living society, God-dependent, and finding perfect freedom in God-service, "till we all come in the unity of the faith, and of the knowledge of the Son of God, unto a perfect man, unto the measure of the stature of the fullness of Christ."

In ire and exultation,
Aflame with faith and free,
Lift up a living nation,
A single sword to Thee.

And this power is the Liturgy of God's Church. For the Liturgy is the extension of the Divine Incarnation in God's people. It comprises her dogma, her hierarchy, her Sacraments, her creed; it is the Body of Christ in the truest sense of the phrase, a living organism, visible and tangible and passible, enshrining the Very Godhead, invisible, intangible, impassible; dispensing through its material channels spiritual gifts, healing, preaching, teaching, shepherding the lost and binding up the wounded, visiting the fatherless and widows in their affliction, and manifesting its faith by its works.

This, and this alone, working through the souls and bodies sanctified into itself by its Baptism, is the only instrument which can be used by the Catholic Sociologist in continuing the social work of Jesus of Nazareth who went about doing good.

The great tragedy of the life of our Lord for the agnostic is Calvary. "Rest now in Thy glory, noble pioneer," exclaims Renan. "Thy work is done, Thy divinity is founded." But it is not true. We know it to be false. The work had but started, the divinity founded from all eternity still works itself out in terms of space and time, the noble pioneer rests in His glory, but still remains the ever-active, self-revealing redeemer of the souls and bodies of men through the supernatural Church which is His Body. The Catholic Church still remains to shew to a world groaning and travailing in pain together the only way of salvation. To the nations of the earth we still proclaim with perfect confidence, *Extra ecclesiam nulla salus*. No social contract can save the world today; where internationalism has failed, supernationalism can succeed only provided that the supernational be also supernatural.

And the God-given way of bringing this truth home to each human soul, and through each human soul to the whole human race, is the Most Holy Sacrament of the Altar. The presupposition of the Mass is the same as that of a Catholic sociology, it presupposes that the human race is an organic

whole, not an agglomeration of atomic individuals, but an organism of which the constituent parts are interdependent, so that when one member suffers the whole body must suffer with it.

Every Catholic Altar is a nucleus of spiritual life, but it is nothing apart from the Altar whereupon is offered the sacrifice of Calvary pleaded from all eternity. The glory of priesthood is co-equal with the selflessness of its service, the priest is the *servus servorum Dei*, a priest without people is as meaningless as a shepherd in a universe where sheep are unknown.

An old Romanesque Church has been restored lately in the South of France. The Altar was transferred from the east end to the crossing of the transept. There it stands surrounded by circular rails, alone, without any ornament, a stone table on pillars to express the Table of Sacrifice in which all around share. On the side of the Altar are the words: *Memento Domine omnium circumstantium*. This is a typical expression of the new direction given to Eucharistic worship which is spreading on the Continent at the same time as the theology of the *Corpus mysticum*. The sentimentalism of Eucharistic devotions, and the consequent stress on the over-localization of the Divine Presence, gives way to a more theological and virile conception of our sharing in the Sacrifice of the Living Christ.

In thus making the Altar the centre of parish life, we are adopting the surest way to lay solid foundations for our Catholic Sociology. But we must be careful of what we mean when we say that it is "the Mass that matters." Everything that emphasizes the power of the Mass to strengthen the bond of fellowship is a step towards the establishment of the Kingdom of God upon earth, but everything that tends to veil or obscure this aspect of Eucharistic worship is a nail in the coffin of a Christian social order. We have to remake the service of Communion what by right it is; it must be reclothed in the mystery, solemnity and majesty which it lost with the coming of the low, private, individualistic Mass of the Counter-reformation.

The solitary priest at the Altar who turns what is meant as an objective means of grace for all into a subjective private devotion for one, the multitudes who weekly come to "hear" their Mass, or daily seek the solitude alone with the "Prisoner of the Tabernacle," are but fulfilling half their function as Christians: "God and my own soul" is their concern, but this is not enough, this is not essentially Christian; the reader of Plotinus or Proclus or of the Vedistic literature of the Orient will soon discover that Christianity has nothing new to offer us in this. Time after time in the history of the race the appalling conditions of poverty and ignorance, under which the majority

has lived, has compelled men to think. In answer to this many systems of religion and philosophy have arisen: Buddhism, Neoplatonism, the Græco-Roman mysteries, have all, by a pantheistic mysticism, offered to their initiates a way of escape from the degradation of the temporal to the glories of the eternal. But a way of escape for individuals is as nothing compared with the virile challenge of the Catholic Church. The Christian cannot tread alone the path to Heaven; it is by caring for the fortunes of his fellows that he works out his own salvation. The selfish seeking of the bliss of Nirvana or special spiritual luxuries bestowed in return for a particular course of asceticism or ritual of initiation is directly challenged by the κένωσις of the Incarnate God, who took upon Himself the form of a servant and identified Himself with mankind that we, too, might be welded into one Body in the power of the Incarnation. In the service of mankind we gain the spiritual benefits which non-Christian religious philosophy tried to give by individual communion with the Divine: "Seek ye first the Kingdom of God, and all these things shall be added unto you."

The Mass is first and last a Communion, something for the consolidating and spreading of God's Kingdom; it is not enough to tell people to come and see what great things the Lord hath done. Our Lord, in His Holy Sacrament as in the flesh, only calls men to Himself in order to give them of Himself and then to send them away again: "Go ye therefore, and teach all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost: teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you: and, lo, I am with you alway, even unto the end of the world."

De la Taille says that in the Upper Room our Lord *offered* the Sacrifice which He consummated on the Cross. We may say that the Eternal Sacrifice is an eternal act, always present and available, and that the Eucharistic service unveils it by transferring it into the sphere of time and space by making it available to the faithful *hic et nunc* through Communion.

The Communion alone can keep the emphasis on this most important aspect of our Lord's teaching. It is by participation in the one Holy Food of the Lord's Body that we can be welded together into a spiritual and victorious force, "for we, being many, are one bread and one body: for we are all partakers of that one bread."

Such a spirituality and worshipfulness will not result in any subjective quietism, it will inspire the faithful to fulfil the Divine command to give freely of what they have freely received. So it is that the Church, in her purely spiritual and sacramental character, can set working the leaven which will

leaven the whole lump of the world's social systems. To the greatest of the mystics this has always been clear; spirituality cannot be merely a matter of personal self-salvation. Plato realized that the mystic, having enjoyed the contemplation of the absolute, will naturally desire to remain absorbed in such contemplation. "But," he continues sharply, "this must not be allowed; they must be made to descend again among the prisoners in the den, and partake of their labours and honours, whether they are worth having or not."

And he foresees the objection which naturally springs to our lips, "But is not this unjust? Ought we to give them a worse life when they might have a better?"

And the answer might have been written by one who had heard the message of Jesus that only they who lose their lives in the service of the Kingdom can save them: "You have forgotten, my friend, the intention of the legislator, who did not aim at making any one class in the state happy above the rest; the happiness was to be in the whole state, and he held the citizens together by persuasion and necessity, making them benefactors of the state, and therefore benefactors of one another; to this end he created them, not to please themselves, but to be his instruments in binding up the state."

Such must be the outcome of any well-reasoned philosophy of religion; the religious man who seeks to himself spiritual luxury to the comfort of his own soul, and seeks no further, commits the sin of Dives; the Catholic Liturgy, and especially the culmination of that Liturgy in the Catholic Mass, is a standing protest against any such interpretation of Christian thought.

It is significant that these truths concerning the Holy Mysteries which have been long obscured have, during the past century, been reasserted by competent champions on the Continent. The failure of the social movements on the Continent is, to a great extent, due to the absence of the Liturgical spirit in nineteenth-century parishes. Individualism and the mysticism of reparation, suffering and compassion (typified by devotion to the Sacred Heart, our Lady of Sorrows and reparations to the Blessed Sacrament) were holding the parishes in a state of passive acceptance. Individuals like Montalembert and Le Tour du Pin, de Mur did their best, but there was no social religious philosophy for them to work on.

Sending the apostles of the movement to enclosed retreats to feed their zeal was very good in itself. But the spiritual hothouse has its dangers, the élite cannot do everything; it is the sharing together by leaders and followers in the common spiritual food which must be the motive force behind such a movement.

It is only since the War that the Liturgical spirit has gained sufficient influence to give backbone to social action. Now there is appearing a new sense of fellowship and social responsibility in Christ. The better understanding of the Easter mystery has replaced, to some extent, the effeminate mysticism of the last centuries by the sense of victorious Resurrection, which is the real message of Christ to the world.

At the same time there has been the interesting parallel of the revival of the sacramental life within our own communion, and with it the consequent interest in a Catholic social policy. The danger is that we of the Church of England should adopt those unfortunately subjective practices from which there are already signs of the Roman Communion moving away.

Wherever the congregation can be made to feel "*Liturgy-conscious*," there the primary concern of each individual will be the deepening and enhancing of the spiritual life which all share in common, and then the Mass will appear indeed (as St. Augustine termed it) the *Sacramentum unitatis*.

Scientifically and philosophically such a doctrine is the only one which can be justified. There is no time to go far into details of history and anthropology, but a thinker of our own school of religious thought, Professor E. O. James, in his *Origins of Sacrifice*, has carefully worked out the theory of sacrifice, shewing it to be an act of the community for the community, and a recognition of the fact that in itself the community is not sufficient of itself to help itself. There, too, it can be seen that when the public and corporate element goes out of religion then magic enters in. The medicine-man or magician is he who, by his own inherent powers, can bend the supernatural to his own ends; the priest is he who, by the power of God, is made the servant of the citizens of the Kingdom, "for the perfecting of the saints, for the work of the ministry, for the edifying of the body of Christ."

The spiritual unity of mankind is the Catholic explanation of what the social psychologist calls the instinct of the herd; the fact that man alone is not self-sufficient, that society is organic, having its unit in the family rather than the individual —all this is a protest against the isolation of the individual soul on a solitary quest for spiritual satiety.

Furthermore, those fundamental factors in religion which Von Hügel calls "creatureliness," and which Otto calls "the sense of the numinous," and which underlie the philosophy of Karl Barth, those feelings of awe and reverence and wonder which, we are told, first spoke of God within the heart of men, are co-existent with the desire for fellowship and company. The same numinous experience of the thunderstorm or the

earthquake which brings man to his knees before God is that which draws him into a sense of closest unity within and interdependence on his fellow-men.

In other words, the Fatherhood of God implies the brotherhood of man not only philosophically, but also anthropologically.

The much-vaunted atheistic materialism of Communist Russia has been compelled to see this, for we are told that in Russia a new, simple and direct Liturgy is in the making. What the future of the Leninistic Liturgy will be, we must wait and see; but is it not a fact of some importance and full of meaning for the Catholic sociologist who desires to build up a social order on a Christian foundation? Russia, with keen insight into psychological reality and a determined faith in her social ideal, is utilizing the immense possibilities of the religious instinct. She sees that social zeal and enthusiasm require the help of forms of worship, and to that end she combines sociology and worship. Russian peasants and workmen are supplied with new ikons of Lenin, bearing real liturgical inscriptions: "*Lenin is always with us : Lenin protects us : Lenin curses capitalists.*".

It is with inscriptions of this kind, less Lenin and his curses and plus Christ in the breaking of bread, that the Early Church in the Catacombs began its challenge of the pagan order.

That small company of the Catacombs changed the world, but what has become of the reforming fervour of those millions of Christians who pray today: "Our Father, Thy Kingdom come on earth"? The Christian criticism of the Russian leaders would be their scepticism on the dogmatic foundation of their Liturgical experiment and its dubious sincerity. Why, then, is it that our Christian worship, grounded not on a myth or a popular "idol" but on the most objective of all realities, is not a power which calls the faithful to the thick of the battle for the establishment of the Kingdom of God on earth?

Catholic sociology must recall Catholic worship to its social vocation, or rather remind it that, as the parent of Catholic sociology, it is its duty to foster, shepherd, stimulate and feed its natural offspring. We may forget, but we can never dispute the fact that Christian sociology is the necessary outcome and logical conclusion of Christian worship.

A Theist who rejects the Incarnation would build up a social theory on God as Creator, Providence and Ruler of the universe, and would teach that no sincere prayer can leave out the establishment of God's will in society as well as in the individual. But the Catholic has at his disposal arguments much more powerful. There is a tremendous wealth of Catholic doctrine to give rational justification for the intimate connection which unites worship and sociology. By the union of both we have

means to exalt the imagination and to rouse the enthusiasm of the multitude towards social action.

There is still much valuable material awaiting research and application which may have to be left to the coming generation. Christian worship, like all living things, is a complex entity, and as such is very adaptable. During the twenty centuries of its existence it has undergone many modifications and changes. It has reflected the outlook, expressed the needs, and undergone the influence of many different civilizations—a fact on which Christian liturgiologists are throwing more and more light, though, owing to the extreme complexity and subtlety of the problems involved, they do not yet seem prepared to give any detailed account of liturgical evolution.

The twentieth century, therefore, according to its particular characteristics, must make its contribution to the liturgical storehouse, as each past century has done.

Archæologists, liturgiologists, theologians, controversialists and artists are all eager for liturgical reform from their own point of view. Why should not the sociologist gain a hearing in a matter which concerns him deeply? There is endless controversy over very technical points of rubrics, ceremonial, structure of the Canon, and so forth, which is not without causing impatience and disappointment in thoughtful laymen, who cannot help feeling that often issues of importance are being forgotten for the sake of scholastic or archæological subtleties. Although these undoubtedly have their interest and value, they must not be allowed to usurp the whole field. The claims of sociology will have to be introduced, not indiscreetly, but wisely and forcibly.

The most important and fundamental of these claims which would probably bring about gradually practical changes and improvements, is that the full theology of Christian worship should be systematically taught from every pulpit and in every school and Bible class. That teaching, if it is full, implies as its fundamental truth the corporate aspect of Christian worship and its sociological implications.

The doctrinal basis for such a teaching is there. Christian worship has its origin in the double fellowship which the Incarnation and Redemption have created (*a*) between God and man; (*b*) between man and Christ. This relationship is distinct from the purely natural relationship which unites creatures to their Creator or to one another. It confirms, deepens and extends the purely natural relationships; it is based on them, but raises them to the spiritual level. It is the result of the special initiative of God who intrudes to create a new situation. He says that by His will and irrevocable decision the human

shall not be a purely natural order, but must be permeated through and through by Himself. The Word was made flesh and dwelt amongst us not only to save individuals in the Kingdom of Satan, but to bring the Kingdom of God here on earth, and to establish a new order in which natural and supernatural meet.

Christ, the Incarnate Word, based the new worship on the formula: "Our Father, Thy Kingdom come on earth," and on His own mediation.

Christian worship is corporate (1) because the Fatherhood of God is extended to all men and claims that His Kingdom should embrace all men and their activities, and (2) because it receives from the mediation of Christ a fresh element of corporateness. The Christian approaches the Father through Christ, who has two natures—the one human and historical, the other Divine. From the beginning He is called Lord. Behind the historical is the "mystical" Jesus. St. John and St. Paul describe Him under the allegories of "the Vine and the branches," "the mystical Body," and at the Last Supper a sacramental pledge of the mystical Jesus is given. The supreme prayer is: *Ut unum sint*. Jesus is unthinkable alone, on the one hand apart from His Father, on the other apart from all the redeemed; His mystical self is a Communion.

The individual soul cannot go to God without passing through the full Jesus, both historical and mystical. The individual soul seeking God alone, or Jesus alone, will be disappointed. There is no such abstraction in the Christian reality. Hence the essential corporateness of Christian worship.

It is true that the Fatherhood of God, the implications of the Incarnation, and the indwelling of the Holy Spirit gave a supernatural dignity to individual souls, and brought about an individualism unknown in non-Christian worlds old and new. The dignity of the soul, life, body and rights of the individual is essentially Christian. Such a dignity is conferred on all human beings, all are *in potentia* redeemed. The hope of salvation is for all—sinners and pagans, as well as the faithful. The fact that God calls them all makes them all of great value, and brings about a God-willed individualism.

But Christian individualism is checked by the Cross. If the Incarnation raises human nature, the Cross does not allow it to rise save by dying unto itself. The Incarnation and Redemption, the Crib and the Cross, are one *Actio Divina*.

Our modern individualism is the result of a dissociation between Incarnation and Redemption. The dignity and rights conferred by them are accepted without the duties they imply.

Christian individualism must die to live. It is an individualism connected with millions of other individualisms. The ideal

is the individualism of Christ. It bears in itself a divine dignity and the rights of sonship, but also a simultaneous responsibility and solicitude for all the other sons of God. It is an individualism sacrificed on the Cross.

The emphasis on the theology of Christian worship will shew humanitarian reformers what support and backbone positive Christianity can give to their generous instincts, and it will bring them, their experience and energy, to the service of Christian sociology. We want their blood in our anæmic congregations so meek and mild, so narrowly religious. The fact that a full presentation of Christianity with all its social implications will deeply affect a Communist must be well known to us all.

Moreover, we shall thus displace the centre of religious interest and establish a healthier proportion in the preoccupations of those millions of devout souls who want to be saved from themselves. The priest is commissioned by Christ to lead and to teach. The way is not altogether the one our modern congregations like to follow, and the teaching is not the one they like to listen to. Shall we be led by our flock to the marshes of sentimental individualism, or shall we lead them on the high hills? Communism and Fascism have not taken half measures to enforce their gospels, why then should Christianity?

All that is dear to the members of this conference and not yet accepted by a large proportion of the Church, such as sound sacramentalism and integrity of doctrine, if put to the service of the cause of corporate worship may lose their offensiveness. Put forward as isolated challenges, they are misunderstood.

It is for a paper of this kind to be constructive rather than destructive, but a vigorous protest against individualistic pietism is absolutely necessary; the Catholic cannot encourage this and, at the same time, work out a social policy on spiritual lines, for the two are diametrically opposed. It is to give with one hand and to take away with the other.

Let us therefore try to give a vision of the completed Kingdom of God to all Christian people in the liturgical offices of the Church, the spiritual framework on which the Kingdom of God must be reared.

Let them see their Mass as the centre of parish social life, the full Mass—surely the great Mass of the day, that on which the Catholic lavishes the beauty of art and music and ritual which he loves, must also be that at which he comes to make that highest act of adoration of which man is capable, the act of Communion with the Divine. What is the meaning of the censing at the offertory when oblations, altar, priest and sacred ministers, and, finally, the whole congregation are sanctified as a sweet-smelling savour, well-pleasing to the Lord, if we stop

short there? The ritual act must be crowned by the actual offering of all; the partakers in the Body and Blood of Christ are partakers in His redemptive work, like Him they come to give all that they may receive more.

Let us not allow sophistry to snatch this vision of the Family of Christ from our midst; let us not argue that Mass without Communion does not exist because the priest at least communicates, or that there is no such thing as a private Mass, because there must at least be a server present. This is to appeal to the letter and to ignore the spirit. It is only a glorious and inspiring vision which can enable us to achieve the end at which this conference aims, for as the proverb so truly says, "Where there is no vision, the people perish." Let us be practical; it was for the people that Christ died, it is for the service of the people that Christ lives in Liturgy and Church and Priesthood; it is for the service of the people that we are assembled here. Give them back their Mass; it was to give England the Mass that our fathers of the Oxford Movement fought the battles of the past hundred years: let us not keep them back from it now; since the time of Pius X. the continental Church has been more and more restoring the Liturgy to the people: we cannot do better than follow those who are responding to the teaching of Herwegen, Casel, Beauduin and Guardini.

The ἀγαπη might well be revived in our parishes as the natural sequence of the parish Mass, so that, in the most informal way, the spiritual unity of priest and people at the Altar may be fostered in a homely circle of fellowship. By social intercourse, fostered beneath the ægis of the Catholic Church, the mother of us all, people will begin to realize that their domestic and social problems are her daily concern, and in this realization they will begin to bear witness to the pagan world of today to the power of the care of the Church. The heresy of subjective religion and that of the non-religious philanthropism of today is one and the same: it is to severour duty towards God from our duty towards our neighbour; but it is more glaring in the case of those who daily confess their belief in the fusion of human nature and Divine in the Person of Jesus of Nazareth, the Son of God. To serve Christ in His Blessed Sacrament and to ignore Him in His poor is the sin of the Pharisee.

Beginning at the Altar, this spirit of fellowship and responsibility and the interdependence of the Body of Christ will spread to all other activities which the restoration of the worshipful spirit must affect.

The Sacrament of Penance is not only the reconciliation of the individual sinner to the offended Creator, it is the reception of the prodigal back into the bosom of the Christian family;

it is not private but corporate; there is joy not only among the angels of God, but throughout the Body of Christ in paradise and on earth over the one sinner that repenteth. The forgiveness of the father of the prodigal does not end in the first private embrace, but in the calling together of the whole family to the father's table; the joy of the woman who has lost her silver piece was only to be fulfilled in the calling together of her neighbours and friends. Even so, it is a paradox, but a very true paradox, to say that the greatest moment of our Holy Week confession is our Easter Communion, because there we are restored in corporate joy, the rejoicing of the family over the offender's return, the joy of the whole body at the restoration of the diseased member.

Again the Sacrament of Baptism is a subject for universal rejoicing; it is the birth of a new member to the Body of Christ, and when a new member is received into the Church it seems absurd to have to point out that the Church ought to be there to receive it. It cannot, therefore, be too strongly urged that the Sacraments and Offices of the Church be made more and more public to foster the spirit of true Christian fellowship. People must learn to recognize that the Church, like the Incarnation, is the Divine response to the needs of fallen humanity. From the thirteenth century onwards the history of Europe has been that of the secularization of society. It is for us to re-sanctify civilization, and the instruments for the achievement of that end are ready to our hand if we can but see our way to use and not to abuse them.

To re-emphasize the divine character of the Church is to prove the truth of the Master's promise that He would not leave us comfortless: the Catholic Church is the Incarnation of the Spirit, the bodies of the faithful are temples of the Holy Ghost. The principles of the service of humanity for which the Kingdom of God stands are the same as those for which the Catholic Church stands, for the Catholic Church is the Kingdom of God.

Let us remember that *Laborare est orare*, that every time we pray, "Thy Kingdom come, on earth as it is in Heaven," we must put that prayer into action. The Holy Liturgy *is* the Church in action, it is the unfolding of the Divine purpose in our midst and the fountain of the power requisite for all other Catholic action.

On this foundation, and on this foundation alone, can we build up a devotion and a worshipful attitude which will not burn itself out in sentimental quietism, but will carry its worship with Apostolic fervour from the Altar to the slum and give back to the Catholic Church that position which is hers by Divine right—the proud position of the healer of the nations.

G. W. BURNINGHAM.

MISCELLANEA

CORRESPONDENCE

DEAR SIR,

The subjoined resolution was passed by the General Synod of the Ecclesiastical Province of New Zealand (Anglican) in April, 1934. We cannot, of course, deal with the subject here in New Zealand. It is a matter for biblical scholars and publishing experts in England.

If you are in general agreement with the need for an improved format for the Authorized Version of the Bible, whether agreeing with the details submitted or not, I would be most grateful if you could give it your support and publicity. The details are only of a tentative nature.

The resolution reads as follows.

19. Archdeacon G. H. Gavin to move:

(*a*) That this General Synod of New Zealand considers that the time has come when it is advisable to cease publication of the Authorized Version of the Bible in its present unsuitable format, and to adopt a format more in keeping with the best of modern book production. That it believes there is a large public ready to welcome such a change, and that it is convinced that it would greatly facilitate the public reading of the Bible and lead to a more intelligent study of it in private reading.

(*b*) While not contemplating the alteration of a single word in this great English classic, the Synod would welcome expert consideration of the following changes.

(1) That no type be used smaller than 14-point size.

(2) That the double columns be abolished, and the typescript allowed to run right across the page as in an ordinary book.

(3) That indentations, etc., for chapters and verses be abolished, and chapter and verse numbers be relegated to the margin for reference purposes.

(4) That poetry be printed as poetry.

(5) That dialogue be printed as dialogue.

(6) That quotation marks be used.

(7) That dislocations of the text be set right where misplacement of passages is deemed to have occurred.

(8) That the Bible be re-arranged in chronological sequence so as to shew an intelligent reader the development in religious thought.

(9) That the Apocrypha be more generally included in the various editions.

(10) That a more suitable colour be substituted for the present black cover.

(*c*) That a copy of sections A and B of this resolution be forwarded to their Graces the Archbishops of Canterbury, York and Armagh, the Syndics of the University Presses of Oxford and Cambridge, and to Messrs. Eyre and Spottiswoode, the King's Printers, with a request that a favourable consideration be given to this much-needed reform.

ST. MARY'S VICARAGE,
NEW PLYMOUTH,
TARANAKI, NEW ZEALAND.

G. H. GAVIN,
Archdeacon of Taranaki.

THE ENDING OF ST. MARK

ACCORDING to C. H. Turner, who represents the generally held opinion, it is "incredible" that the Gospel originally ended with "for they were afraid." Nearly all scholars hold that the last part of the MS. has been lost. Some are even able to restore the lost word which followed immediately—*ἐφοβοῦντο γὰρ τοὺς Ἰουδαίους*, "for they were afraid *of the Jews*." This note puts the case for doubting the generally accepted view.

1. There is no real objection to ending a sentence with *γάρ*. R. R. Ottley in *Journal of Theological Studies*, July 1926, collects many examples, of which Genesis xviii. 15 is perhaps the most familiar: Sarah says: *οὐκ ἐγέλασα ἐφοβήθη γάρ* ("I laughed not: for she was afraid"). There are many examples in the papyri. We need not suppose Mark to have been such a stylist as to shrink from the usage.

2. But could a *Gospel* end thus? Why not? Mark's book was written for a Christian community which believed in the Resurrection. There was no possibility of misunderstanding on the part of the readers. The Easter story as told by him contains the news of the empty tomb, of the rising of Jesus the Nazarene, and (by implication) of the Galilæan appearances. The followers of Jesus, he relates, were afraid when the wind and the sea obeyed Him (iv. 41), when He foretold the Crucifixion (ix. 32), and when He went ahead of them going up to Jerusalem (x. 32). The women on this occasion, like the disciples previously, were filled with awe when confronted with something supernatural. What note could be more appropriate on which to end the Gospel? "They said nothing to anyone" clearly refers only to the immediate occasion; St. Mark cannot mean that their lips were for ever sealed.

3. We note also that the Gospel begins with the baptism of John and the coming of Jesus to the Jordan, followed by a supernatural attestation to the Divine Sonship of Jesus. The coming of the Son into the world is veiled from our eyes in this Gospel. Is there anything surprising in the Resurrection's being announced by an angelic visitant, the actual appearances being hidden from our gaze? Is not St. Mark's method in this case surprisingly modern in its conception of history?

4. All attempts to reconstruct the lost ending of St. Mark have failed. There is nothing in Matthew xxviii. and Luke xxiv. that really helps us in getting back to a common original. So, if the ending of a Gospel with "they were afraid" still seems incredible, we shall probably think it best to fall back on the alternative suggestion to that of the destruction of the last page, namely that the Evangelist intended to continue the story but was for some reason prevented. This leads us to consider whether the Resurrection appearances were not deliberately postponed to another book, in which they were to form the first chapter of Church history, the Acts of Jesus in the Church. Nothing is more probable than that Mark, who himself had played a prominent part in the history of the Church at Jerusalem, after writing the story of the Ministry from the information of others, formed a plan of writing what he knew at first hand. Some have thought that one of the sources for the Jerusalem history used by Luke in the Acts goes back to a continuation of the Second Gospel. Anyone writing such a narrative would have to decide what to make of the Resurrection, Ascension, and Pentecost stories. St. Luke, confronted with this problem, apparently assigned the Ascension to the Acts and in the

Gospel told the same story as the last of the Resurrection appearances. Later his Gospel narrative was revised in order to make the Ascension explicit, by the addition of the so-called "Western non-interpolations." St. Mark may well have acted in regard to the Resurrection appearances as St. Luke did in regard to the full story of the Ascension.

W. K. LOWTHER CLARKE.

NOTES ON PERIODICALS

Jewish Quarterly Review. Vol. xxv., No. 4.

Professor Israel Davidson, writing on *Recent Studies in Mediæval Poetry*, notes, with a satisfaction that many will share, that in this unfrequented field of research more progress has been made in Germany than in any other European country during the last few years, and that in the land where hatred of the Jew has become a political dogma, there are still places of learning "where true Christian gentlemen are fostering Jewish learning without fear or favour."

Professor W. F. Albright reviews Olmstead's *History of Palestine and Syria to the Macedonian Conquest*, which he regards as "an achievement of the first importance." Olmstead accepts the authenticity of Ezekiel against Tolley (see Dr. W. E. Barnes' important article, "The Scene of Ezekiel's Ministry and his Audience," *Journal of Theological Studies*, April, 1934), defends the authenticity of the Aramaic letters in Ezra, and accepts the traditional succession Ezra-Nehemiah against the more commonly accepted Nehemiah-Ezra.

Dr. Michael Higger gives the text and comments on a hitherto unknown work of—probably—Abraham Yarhi of the twelfth century. Professor E. A. Spicer contributes some useful reviews of recent works on *Mesopotamia Past and Present*. Dr. Bernard Heller continues his examination of the contents of Ginzberg's *Legends of the Jews*. Dr. Julius Greenstone chronicles the progress of *The Encyclopædia Judaica*, the ninth volume of which appeared in 1932; but with "the rise to power of Adolf Hitler and the consequent cruel persecution of the Jews," editors and contributors are scattered and the completion of the work remains uncertain.

R. D. MIDDLETON.

Ephemerides Theologicæ Lovanienses. April, 1934.

This is a very interesting number. The first article is a study of the theology of William of Occam as regards his teaching about the Church as the Rule of Faith. The writer, Fr. Van Leeuwen, O.F.M., distinguishes two periods in Occam's thought, the first going down to 1328, the year in which his break with Pope John XXII. occurred, and the second in his remaining years. In his earlier writings he lays all the emphasis on the Creeds and ecclesiastical decisions; the Church is the living guarantee of revealed doctrine. In the later period he stresses rather the unanimous Faith of the Church. He rejects any idea of papal infallibility, but he is uncertain as regards the infallibility of a General Council. Of all the doctors of that epoch, he relies upon the text of Gratian, *nisi deprehendatur a fide devius*, as telling against the infallibility of the Pope and emphasizes contradictory papal decisions in the same sense. The idea that the Pope

might act in a double capacity, that is to say, as Pope or as a private theologian, was not yet above the horizon. Occam's work had great influence with the conciliar party, and was of importance in forming the circle of ideas from which the subsequent protestantism arose.

The second article is a careful and very full Latin monograph on the Relation between the Juridical and the Moral Order. It is based, as would be expected, upon the teaching of St. Thomas. Morality is that part of the Divine Law of the Universe which is applicable to man. The Moral Order is the complex of human relations viewed under the unificatory conception of the End of Man; the Juridical Order is that part of the Moral Order which is solely concerned with Justice, and Justice is about external things and actions. Thus the juridical order, extending only to external acts, is not concerned with the End of Man *simpliciter*, but is an integral part of the moral order which is so concerned. This Catholic doctrine of morals and justice reached its perfect synthesis in the thirteenth century, the "theocracy" of the Middle Ages. Since that period the tendency to separate more and more politics from religion has resulted in a falling away from that doctrine. Fr. Van Overbeke, O.P., who writes this article, passes in review a number of representative thinkers who have tried to substitute other theories for that of the Thomists, such as Machiavelli, Bacon, Grotius, Hobbes, Rousseau and Kant. He traces in all of them, in some more, in others less, the fatal tendency to separate morals from politics and to deny "natural right" in any true sense.

The controversy between those who admit and those who deny the legitimacy of "counselling the lesser of two evils" is continued. Fr. Bender, O.P., makes a vigorous rejoinder in the negative sense. To counsel evil can never be right, but this does not mean that it is never advisable to "exhibit" or mention to one determined to sin a course of action which would be a less grievous sin than the one he originally had in view.

The usual book notices are given. In the section *Chronica*, under *Angleterre*, a very appreciative notice is given of the late Lord Halifax—*sa mémoire demeure en vénération parmi les catholiques*.

W. R. V. BRADE.

Zeitschrift für die N.T.liche Wissenschaft. 1934. Heft 1.

The articles are perhaps less interesting than usual. C. Schneider, writing on the Centurion at the Cross, shews how later legend claims him as a local saint. In Gregory of Nyssa he is a Cappadocian (Longinus); so in the Golden Legend. In the Middle Ages he appears as a Mantuan, a Frenchman, even (later still) a Spaniard. German theological speculation, based on the fact of German legionaries in Syria, made him a German. And this "with the growth of German national feeling in the nineteenth century" has become a commonplace of poetry and art. "R. Schäfer has drawn the Centurion with the face of Bismarck."

Prof. von Dobschütz writes on the vocabulary and style of the Epistle to the Romans, in which there are 7,048 words in all, 1,041 different words. The minutest variations in order are chronicled. The conclusion is that St. Paul was an orator, not a writer, able to use the Greek language in a most skilful manner, which yet differed greatly from current Greek usage. If he could dictate such a letter, what must his sermons have been like! The Corinthians' estimate of them, "his speech is of no

account," is inexplicable, unless indeed their taste had been ruined by false standards of rhetoric.

Patristic articles deal with the Syriac *Corpus Athanasianum*, the sources of Tertullian's *De Anima*, the newly published writings of Theodore of Mopsuestia, and the new text, double the length of the existing printed text, and derived from the margin of a Florentine MS., of Eusebius' Commentary on Isaiah.

W. K. L. C.

Zeitschrift für die A.T.liche Wissenschaft. 1934. Heft 1.

Two contributions in this number are fascinating. K. Budde discusses the theory of Mowinckel and others that Zadok was the Jebusite priest-king of Jerusalem, dispossessed by David from his secular power, but allowed to continue as priest of the sanctuary, which presently became Yahweh's. The name is the same as (Melchi-)zedek, if the first part, meaning "king," is omitted. In the course of the refutation the reader is enlightened on many important matters. F. Dornseiff begins a series of notes on "Antikes zum Alten Testament," which are as delightful as they are (probably) wildly wrong. Early Hebrew and Greek literature were both based on the ideas current in Mesopotamia and Egypt. Therefore Homer and Hesiod illustrate Genesis at every turn. The change of divine and other names, Yahweh-Elohim, Abram-Abraham, Jacob-Israel, etc., is paralleled in Homer, where we find Paris-Alexander, Trojans-Dardanoi, etc. The Pentateuch was written by a Levite in Northern Israel soon after 930. The author drives home his lessons by using different styles. The serpent and the forbidden tree are the Hebrew analogue of apple of the Hesperides guarded by a serpent in the twelfth labour of Heracles. The meal of Abraham with the three men corresponds to the Tantalos story; the beauty of Lot's visitors to that of Helen; etc. The appearance of the essay in a learned review makes one doubt the German capacity to "prove all things, hold fast that which is good." Nevertheless the essay sets the mind wandering over many fair fields of imagination.

W. K. L. C.

REVIEWS

THE MISHNAH. Translated from the Hebrew by Herbert Danby, D.D. Oxford University Press. 18s.

"Moses desired that even the Mishnah should be committed to writing; but the Holy One, blessed be He, foresaw that the peoples of the world would in the future translate the Torah, and read it in Greek, and then they would say: We too are Israelites. . . . But the Mishnah is the Holy One's *mysterion*, and He reveals it only to the righteous (*i.e.*, the Jews), as it is written (Ps. xxv. 13): 'The mystery (*sod*) of the Lord is to them that fear Him.'"

Thus runs a Rabbinic text (*Midrash Tanchuma on Genesis*, ed. Buber, p. 88), and its assertion has a certain verity, for few books are so often mentioned and so little known. When the Septuagint became the Bible of the infant Church the Rabbis took on an attitude of hostility towards it which expressed itself in a revision of its text (Aquila's translation); but they took it for granted that the hitherto purely oral tradition would never be committed to writing and could in any case never be translated into any other language—they pictured it as remaining eternally the esoteric heritage of the Jews alone, a sealed book to the outside world. In regard to the Mishnah their belief was in a sense justified, for it still continues to be an "oral" tradition, the most satisfactory exposition of which cannot be found on any printed page. But alas for their hopes! the unrighteous Gentiles could not keep their hands off it, with the result that one complete translation of the Mishnah exists in Latin, several in German, in addition to the considerable number of the Mishnah tractates which have been rendered—with or without the Hebrew text and commentaries—into several languages, including English. Tübingen University is bringing out under the editorship of Professor Gerhard Kittel a series which will cover practically the whole field of early Rabbinic literature in German translations—including the Palestinian Talmud, which is being entrusted to the present writer—and this, together with the forthcoming Soncino Press English translation of the whole Babylonian Talmud, and Cailingold's edition in Hebrew and English of the Mishnah in six volumes, should ensure a pretty complete revelation of this particular *mysterion* to the Christian world.

To this accumulation of research Canon Danby's volume forms a valuable addition. It should prove particularly useful to students on account of its reasonable price, excellent format and ease in the handling—it has been issued in one volume—and the painstaking quality of the labour that has

gone to its making. The fact that several previous translations are available for reference does not make the task of a new editor as easy as might be imagined; a certain familiarity with the background, language and style of the original is imperative, and the present translator proves his possession of this quality more than adequately.

It is a strange phenomenon that this, the dryest of legalistic works, should have ministered to a tradition which one would have thought evokable only by meditation on some more mystical or devotional subject. Consider what the Mishnah really is:

By the end of the second century A.D. the Jews, probably not uninfluenced by the rise of the New Testament, formed a canonical literature of their own, apart from the Old Testament: the Mishnah. The scribes had already begun to dominate Jewish life in the time of Christ, but on the ruins of Jerusalem and the Temple Pharisaic Judaism celebrated its triumph, and the Rabbis endeavoured to interpret the Law, establishing by means of it whatever they considered to be legally binding. They sought by a fixed system of exegesis to reduce the various matters under discussion to some kind of unity. The ideas, the sentences, the words, and even the particles and letters of the scriptures tend more and more to become pegs on which arguments can be hung, and to be arbitrarily used as proofs. This method is called *Midrash*, literally "exposition," originally used in the sense of deducing a rule or a custom (*halakah*) from Scripture. The term is also applied to the systematic verse-by-verse commentary on Scripture.* These *Midrashim* stand by reason of their age and contents in very close relation to the Mishnah, which latter, however, forms the final standardization of the Oral Law and custom, independently of their scriptural basis, and, as we have already stated, in a more or less systematic order, grouping the materials under various headings according to the subjects dealt with. All this seems pretty far removed from fervour of any kind, yet the pursuit of knowledge leads the seeker down many devious paths, and the study of the Mishnah did approach to a sort of ecstasy of scholarship, if such can be: a desiccated intensity difficult for gentiles to comprehend, such as has been immortalized by C. N. Bialik, who is perhaps the greatest of modern Hebrew poets:

> " . . . a figure like a corpse's shade
> That rocks and wavers, bending up and down
> With moaning chant . . . "

"Not one day," he tells us, "but six years, have watched his toil." And it is indeed the case, or was—for the type survives in increasingly small numbers—that youths should

* *Cf. Midrash Sifre on Numbers*, translated by Paul P. Levertoff. S.P.C.K.

become men and young men grow old, their "eyes grow darkened and their faces white" in the musty twilight of obscure synagogues, while they acquired learning, merit and, if they could, fame, by the continued poring over the vast heritage of "the tradition of the elders"—a depressing mass of hair-splitting argument and musty legalism.

One may well doubt whether any Christian student of Rabbinics can today be enveigled into a similar ardour, and perhaps it is just as well. But if he desires a knowledge of the fundamentals of the subject as set forth in the Mishnah, without unnecessary and depressing research into the wastes of the past, Canon Danby's translation should prove a godsend to him.

PAUL P. LEVERTOFF.

THE UNKNOWN GOD. By Alfred Noyes. Sheed and Ward. 7s. 6d.

Rarely does one read an intellectual apologia for Christianity which is satisfying, or a religious autobiography which is not irritating. It was therefore with considerable misgiving that we began to read in this book the history of the religious opinions of a Roman Catholic convert. It was, however, with a sense of solid satisfaction that we finally put the book down. There have been produced few such lucid defences of the faith, few such fascinating accounts of the intellectual side of the pilgrimage from the City of Destruction.

Statements of the rational grounds for belief are published today with unwearying frequency; but their authors seldom steer a middle course between the Scylla of assuming the complete unintelligence of the reader, and the Charybdis of crediting him with a detailed familiarity with philosophical and theological technicalities. Mr. Noyes's account of the intellectual process whereby he passed from agnosticism to the faith of the Incarnation is at once learned and readable. He does not employ the *ex parte* dialectic of the professional apologist; he shews a pleasing appreciation for what is of value in the arguments of those from whom he disagrees, and succeeds in bringing into unmistakable prominence whatever is of permanent value in their thought. Certainly he cannot be convicted of the narrowness of the specialist, which he notes as the characteristic defect of the thinkers of the last hundred years. His reading has been amazingly wide: science, philosophy, theology, literature, all have come within his purview; he has assimilated the thought of Spencer and Darwin, of Hegel and Haeckel, of Shakespeare and Browning, of Swinburne and Hardy. He shews a worthy reverence for the apologetics of Dr. Gore; and though he has

less sympathy with Dr. Barnes than with any other writer whose works he quotes, he does not disdain to borrow an argument from him. It is true that the paths of reasoning along which Mr. Noyes leads his reader have been trod before. His argument in favour of a Personal Creator, his restatement of *Credo quia impossibile est*, his bringing of the moral and æsthetic values as an evidence of the truth of the Christian doctrine of God, can be found in other works; but his treatment of these themes possesses a quality which has been sadly lacking in the works of all philosophers since Plato—not merely extreme clarity of exposition, but the combination of logical sincerity with the temperament of the poet and the mystic. Mr. Noyes never descends to mere rhetoric; but at times he expresses his thought in language of almost unbearable beauty. Sometimes one seems to hear the tones of Bishop Berkeley elucidating a profounder thought than his. It is the fact that the author is a poet which makes this book at once more readable and more profound than similar apologetic works; and if his most original argument, whereby he seeks to prove the divinity of Christ from the artistic miracle of the beauty of his utterances, is open to rather obvious criticisms, we believe that that argument contains a truth which is obscured by the present divorce of literature from religion.

The perfect religious autobiography has been achieved once and once only in the English language. Since 1864 Newman's successors in this literary realm, while occasionally providing readable matter, have somehow failed to give such an account of themselves as will win the sympathy of those who disagree with their conclusions. This is particularly true of those who have found the same haven as Newman, and tend overmuch to depreciate the amenities of the other ports at which they have touched in their spiritual voyage. Mr. Noyes avoids the convert's common failings by ruthlessly confining his account of his progress to the intellectual side; he thus wins a sympathy which he would have forfeited had he attempted to describe his non-intellectual reactions to religion. Only once does he attempt personal reminiscence, in his description of a Procession of the Blessed Sacrament in the grounds of a convent which was once the house of Swinburne. Artistically some one such record was necessary, as an indication that it was no bare intellectual journey which he made towards the Supreme Reality. But we may be grateful that he has confined himself to this single incident; for while the paths of the intellect are similar in the minds of men, so that the thinker always attracts a degree of sympathy in our own thought, the paths of the emotions vary intensely among mankind, and accounts of

events which impelled the emotions of one person towards his conversion, often produce an entirely different reaction in those to whom they are recounted. At least we may say that this temperance has caused Mr. Noyes to succeed in the difficult task of writing an autobiography which is not egotistic.

HUMPHRY BEEVOR.

NOTICES

FREEMASONRY: A CANDID EXAMINATION. By A Past Master. Washbourne and Bogan. 3s. 6d.

This purports to be a description of English Freemasonry by a former master of a lodge who has now joined the Church of Rome. That Church, as all the world knows, to its regret so far as English Freemasonry is concerned, has set its face against all cults bearing that name. This book is duly stamped with the hall-mark of the official censors, so that it may be touched without the use of tongs. Except, however, to vindicate the author's emancipation and to purge him of his sin, it is not quite clear why it has been written. It is a not inaccurate account of many of the historic data and facts of English masonry, but it reveals no secrets, scandals or horrors to cheer the inquiring reader. He does not, as did a minister of the Wesleyan community a few years ago, describe it as Anti-Christ. Rather does he dwell on its inanity, its hollow mockery, and its futility. Just as many Christians find their baptismal vows irksome and priests that they have mistaken their vocation, so do some masons find that freemasonry does not give them what they are looking for. If so, they merely drop out and do not of necessity make a song and dance about it. England is a sufficiently free country still for a man to say what he likes as long as he says it decently. "Past master" is no doubt quite right from his point of view. But as old Cromwell said to the Scots before Dunbar, "We pray you think in your bowells that you may be mistaken in this matter." There is obviously another side to the question, for high dignitaries of the Anglican and Free Churches, Princes of the Blood, including the Prince of Wales, shining lights in every cultured and scientific profession, as well as hundreds of thousands of plain John Citizens in Britain and many more in the United States, think otherwise. Further, in addition to having taken some blind oath of allegiance, they have a peculiar delight and solemn satisfaction in taking an active part in the observances till the end of their days. They persist also in still agreeing that it is "a system of morality veiled in allegory and illustrated by symbol."

So as I have said, why this little book has been written is not very clear, yet it is full of useful information to masons as a book of reference, which is not probably the author's intention, and ninety-nine out of a hundred masons will just smile at the wrong colour thrown on the perfectly good curtain.

GEORGE MACMUNN.

THE LIFE OF ST. JOHN THE BAPTIST. By the Very Rev. Denis Buzy, D.D. Burns Oates and Washbourne. 7s. 6d.

In this book, which has been translated and adapted by Professor J. M. T. Barton, Dr. Buzy discusses with great care and warm devotion almost every conceivable question connected with the Forerunner. The standpoint, in spite of a seeming freedom of discussion in many places, is decidedly conservative. Elizabeth, *e.g.*, "hailed her young cousin as the mother of the Messiah and the mother of God" (p. 37). Again, "The Forerunner's trembling was not a mere natural movement in the womb but was the effect of a special grace, the first profession of faith of him who was to proclaim the Messiah" (p. 38), from which it follows that "St. John enjoyed *at least momentarily* the use of his reason, while still in the womb" (p. 52). Buzy favours an even more thorough-going view, for, he says, "It certainly is difficult to believe that Jesus the divine Child, who dwelt for more than three months in the immediate neighbourhood of His Forerunner, and Himself had the perfect use of reason (while in Mary's womb), was for all those months close to one whose mind, once enlightened, had again lapsed into unconsciousness. Was His three months' visit only of profit to John during its very first moments?" (p. 54). After this we are less surprised at the statement that our Lord, "while He was still in His mother's womb, had made the journey from Galilee to Judea to sanctify His Forerunner" (p. 65), and at the solemn discussion (pp. 137-139) about whether the dove at Jesus' baptism was real or not. Buzy's view is that it was "only an apparition," and that "Jesus and John were the only witnesses of the theophany" (p. 143). The words "He was before me" (John. i. 30) shew that the Baptist believed that Jesus was a pre-existent being (pp. 119-120). According to the Synoptic Gospels, Jesus sought John's baptism only "for the sake of a personal motive in order to receive public testimony to His messianic dignity from the Father and the Holy Spirit" (p. 129), while in the Fourth Gospel the aim is to give to the Baptist "a juridical and peremptory proof that He was the Messiah, the Son of God" (*ibid.*). Buzy is, naturally, much troubled by the contradiction between Matt. iii. 14 and John i. 31 (pp. 132-135 and 140-146). His unsatisfactory conclusion is that before the Baptism John had *personal* knowledge of Jesus' status (Matt.), but had no *juridical* knowledge (John). In discussing Matt. xi. 11 (=Luke vii. 28) Buzy excludes the Blessed Virgin and St. Joseph from the scope of this saying, but without giving clear reasons for his doing so (p. 197). Almost throughout the book we are unconvinced by the reasoning but charmed by the devotion, and although we do not feel at the end that we have learnt more truth about the Baptist, we have learnt to love him more, and this makes the book worth reading.

A. E. MORRIS.

THE REFORMATION AND THE CONTEMPLATIVE LIFE. By David Matthew and Gervan Matthew, O.P. Sheed and Ward. 7s. 6d.

This book is a study of the Reformation from a new angle.

Its authors describe the changes in the early years of that movement as they affected the Carthusians, who are taken as the representative Contemplative Order, and more especially as they affected the Charterhouse in London. The authors have taken pains to consult original

documents so as to bring out the Carthusian reactions to the events of the day. They are skilful in shewing what a bolt from the blue the action of Henry VIII. must have been.

Carthusian houses had been burnt by the Turks in their advance to Vienna, and demolished in the Peasant Risings which followed in the wake of Luther. In a few cases Charterhouses had been suppressed by the State, but Henry VIII. was universally regarded as a champion of orthodoxy. Neither his desire for the annulment of his marriage, nor his quarrel with the Pope, because he failed to get it, would have seemed important to a Carthusian Contemplative, or even interesting. Such things were not uncommon and their results temporary. What was unusual and important was the determination of Henry to be supreme in Church as well as State. This the unsuspecting Carthusians did not realize until confronted with the unpleasant alternative of acknowledging the King as supreme head of the Church, or facing the grim alternative of hanging and disembowelling at Tyburn.

The book has the underlying philosophic purpose of contrasting the theocentric attitude of the Contemplative with the theory of the Erastian state, of which Thomas Cromwell is regarded as the chief exponent. Our authors claim that he foreshadowed the Totalitarian state. Christendom was used to the theory of a Totalitarian empire. Constantine the Great, Charlemagne, Gregory VII., Innocent III., were all its exponents; but a Totalitarian state, cut adrift from Rome, was something new.

The book is somewhat marred by its style, which is often obscure and sometimes ungrammatical, but it throws new light on the period, and is of real value.

C. P. S. CLARKE.

IMAGINATION AND RELIGION. By Lindsay Dewar. Philip Allen. 3s. 6d.

This book should either have been much smaller or considerably larger. The Pastoral and Historical sections might well have been published alone with a brief introduction; alternatively, the Psychological section could have been more carefully thought out and developed into a systematic study of its important subject. In either case the Biblical section might have been omitted with advantage.

As it stands the Psychological section, which should be the foundation of all that follows, covers a bare twenty-two pages and leaves one with the impression that the author has failed to face the fundamental problems of his subject. We should expect to find here an exposition of the nature of imagination and its relations to memory, conceptual thought, reality in general and the personality as a whole, but we are disappointed. The author makes and illustrates many statements, but develops no coherent theory of imagination; indeed, he adopts one definition in his Preface and another in the body of the work, to neither of which does he afterwards allude; imagination and memory are mentioned together on page 3 and then left; conceptual thought is opposed to imagination in a way dear to certain psychologists but most misleading, since thought and imagination are closely interrelated; a fundamental question with regard to the nature of reality is raised in the Preface and dropped; while the relationship of imagination to the rest of the personality is so much ignored that one is driven to wonder what the author sees in personality beyond imagination. Later indeed, he says, concerning the *Spiritual Exercises* of St. Ignatius, that it would "not be inaccurate to call the book Spiritual Exercises for

the Imagination"; whereas it is definitely directed to the culture of *all* the powers of the soul.

The Biblical section, which is twice as long as the foregoing, is even less satisfactory. Though the chapter in itself is very interesting it seems a pity in so small a book to devote thirty-one pages to consideration of the obvious fact that the appeal of the prophets was primarily imaginative. The chapters on Christ and St. Paul do more credit to the author's imagination than to his theology. Was the Dove at our Lord's Baptism really a visual imagination of the prophet Jonah? St. Luke says it was the Holy Ghost, which seems, after all, a more probable supposition. St. Paul's teaching on faith is also somewhat inadequately treated: "It is," we are told, "nearly true to say that in almost any passage in which the word 'faith' occurs in St. Paul's writings, the word 'imagination' can be substituted for it without doing gross violence to the meaning." If this sentence means anything, it means that when St. Paul says "faith" he means "imagination"; "now abideth imagination, hope, charity," "the obedience of imagination," "them who are of the household of imagination." It hardly sounds convincing!

The Pastoral and Historical sections which make up the last half of the book are better, and had they stood alone we should have had little to criticize. The Pastoral section in particular is excellent; into it Canon Dewar has compressed a great deal of clear and wise teaching on Worship and Preaching, which should help to clear the minds of the clergy on certain important first principles and provide some useful practical guidance.

F. P. HARTON.

THIS OUR SACRIFICE: A BRIEF THEOLOGICAL AND HISTORICAL STUDY OF THE EUCHARISTIC OBLATION. By Trevor Jalland. Mowbray. Price 6s.

"Matter is not subject to speech, but speech is subject to matter," says St. Hilary. It is no doubt important to conserve the savour which has come to attach itself to the great words and phrases of religion; we cannot abandon them merely because they are misunderstood; but it is even more important to elicit their true and valid meaning from entanglements which have come to infest them. This is what Mr. Jalland has endeavoured to do in this brief but timely and scholarly treatise. The word "sacrifice" is a notable instance of a grand word so entangled. The author goes to the root of the matter by adopting as its essential definition a phrase coined by a professor of comparative religion. It is "the giving of life to promote or preserve life": and all ideas of destruction or even change are secondary. In one passage he even seems to question whether the idea of oblation is essential. In regard to the Atonement he rejects the merely exemplarist theory and the penal theory in its extremer forms. He adopts a "moral" view of the Sacrifice of the Cross, treating it as the symbol and ultimate expression of perfect self-oblation. Before dealing with the theology of the Eucharistic Sacrifice he provides a full and careful exposition of the difficulties raised by textual criticism as to the institution of the Eucharist, and a brief account of "modernist" theories as to the relation of the Pauline Eucharist to the Last Supper and the early "Breaking of Bread." "The Catholic student," he truly says, "whether priest or layman, ignores . . . at his peril"

the existence of this problem. In the end he deems it wiser not to rely on the longer text of St. Luke, but points to the critics' growing confidence in that of St. Mark, and urges, like other scholars, the complete absence of any evidence of resistance to the Pauline, and Catholic, doctrine of the Eucharistic sacrifices and of the objective character of the Sacramental Gifts. He points out also that, "wherever there is an allusion to the Eucharist in the New Testament," it is always as "an act having in some sense the value of sacrifice."

In regard to the crucial question, "What then do we mean by calling the Eucharist a Sacrifice?" he describes it as "a true and actual representation of the abiding Sacrifice of our Redemption," which consists in the eternally offered Will of Christ.

Coming finally to the Anglican doctrinal and liturgical position, he points out that the rejection of unauthoritative pre-Reformation opinions does not exclude a reasonable doctrine of an objective sacrifice in the Eucharist, and that the English rite, in spite of much that is unfortunate, gives fuller expression than any other liturgy to the Augustinian doctrine of the Church's self-oblation.

To the "practical considerations" contained in the last chapter the reviewer can only add a sympathetic "Hear, hear." Indeed, in the whole book there seems to him little that is open to serious criticism, unless it be that the author is perhaps too confident that the Jews thought of the peace-offering as giving communion with God.

K. D. MACKENZIE.

ROSE FROM BRIER. By Amy Carmichael. S.P.C.K. 3s. 6d.

This is a personal and intimate little book, "properly speaking, not a book at all, but only a bundle of letters." Miss Carmichael, having discovered by painful experience that books written for the sick by the whole tend to be more improving than palatable, has tried the experiment of writing a book "from the *ill* to the ill," and illustrating it with charming photogravures of flowers. The result should bring comfort to many sick-beds.

Miss Carmichael is writing from a sick-bed to a sick-bed and she knows that there is much comfort in community of suffering, so she sets down her own thoughts and small personal experiences with the utmost *naïveté*; a more impersonal style and a less obvious desire to "help" would, in our opinion, have improved the book. In spite of this defect the book is the flowering of a strong evangelical piety of an unusually wide kind; the writer has penetrated deeply into the mystery of suffering and prayer, and has kinship with Julian of Norwich and Ramon Lull no less than with Samuel Rutherford and Handley Moule; moreover, she has the faculty of seeing the spiritual side of everyday things and happenings. She has given to the sick a bedside book of real value and charm.

F. P. HARTON.

SVENSK KYRKOKUNSKAP (INFORMATION ABOUT THE SWEDISH CHURCH). By Yngve Brilioth. S.K.D.B., Stockholm. 9.50 kr.

This is a book containing "all about the Swedish Church" on its institutional and constitutional side, including its relation to the State, its

diocesan and parochial system, the payment of the clergy, the regulation of Divine service, education, church government, foreign missions, voluntary organizations, relations with other churches. Swedish bishops are thus appointed: the chapter notifies the King of the vacancy; he instructs it to make nominations. All the clergy vote according to their rural deaneries; the elections are conducted by the rural deans, and the Chapter votes on the same day. Three names are chosen, and since 1809 the King has been obliged to appoint one of these three to the bishopric (p. 318). There is a special and complicated procedure for the election of an archbishop. The reply of the Swedish bishops in 1922 to the offer of Intercommunion made by Lambeth reveals the difference between the Lutheran and the Anglican outlook. For them, the primary question was whether there was an essential unity of view with regard to grace and salvation through Jesus Christ, not the question of "validity" (p. 428).

A. G. HERBET.

THE CHURCH AND HER CHILDREN. The Rev. H. E. Sheen. Faith Press. Paper, 1s. 6d.; cloth, 2s. 6d.

Mr. Sheen has written a little book which should be of practical value to all who are engaged in the work of Sunday Schools. The book abounds in sensible advice on matters of organization and teaching method. A rightful emphasis is laid, as the Bishop of Southwark points out in a prefatory note, on the essential place of prayer and adoration in the life both of teacher and scholar. There are indications that Mr. Sheen is not fully aware of the conclusions of many other experienced workers in this field. The result is that here and there one feels inclined to disagree upon such matters as grading, and still more often in his exposition of points of child study. To illustrate this by a single example: few educationists would agree that the same lesson could be given satisfactorily to children ranging from seven to fourteen years of age, the differences in mental characteristics being sufficiently satisfied by alternative methods of presentation. Nor do we think Mr. Sheen has really grasped the psychological issues involved in his treatment of the growth of the imagination, which is romantic rather than scientific. The book will be of most use to those who have access to other books on the same topic for comparison.

A. R. BROWNE-WILKINSON.

THE ANGLICAN ARMOURY. By Humphry Beevor. London: The Centenary Press. 3s. 6d.

A CATHOLIC PLEA FOR REUNION. By Father Jerome, R.C. Priest. Williams and Norgate. 3s. [2nd. Ed. By Rev. A. Gille, S.J.]

TOWARDS REUNION. WHAT THE CHURCHES STAND FOR. By S. C. Carpenter, Townley Lord, Bernard Manning, Victor Murray, W. D. Niven, H. G. Wood, and edited by Hugh Martin. Student Christian Movement Press. 1s. 6d.

These three books have this in common, that they bear, indirectly or directly, on the question of the Reunion of Christendom. It cannot be said, I fear, that we are much nearer to unity than we were a generation ago. Differences which were fundamental then still remain; but this at

least is true, that today we are ashamed of our divisions and distressed at our disunion, while then many boasted of their separation, and prided themselves on their "competition in good works." The change has made such books as these possible.

The Anglican Armoury comes from Oxford and the Pusey House and appeared in its first form in the *Church Times*. Its four chapters deal with the breach with Rome, the Continuity of our Orders, Visible Unity and the Primacy of St. Peter, and Popular Arguments against Anglicanism. It deals with defence against attacks from Rome and does not touch on our relations with other Nonconformists. It says nothing, perhaps, but what has been said before often and more fully, but many will, no doubt, be glad to have it put together in this simple form.

A Catholic Plea for Reunion is a very interesting little book if only because it gives us—what can so seldom be got—a glimpse of the life of the Roman Church in England from inside. It is, of course, only the view of an individual of whom we know nothing but that he is a priest writing under a pseudonym, though his inability to get his "woulds" and "shoulds" right suggests that he is an Irishman, loyal and devoted to his Church but "agin the Government." He sets out to "pay a compliment to two sets of people ('Catholics' and Anglicans) by irritating both," and to tell them that "they would make an ideal Church in combination instead of two inadequacies in disjunction." Briefly, his suggestion is that Anglicans should accept the Papal Supremacy and Jurisdiction on the understanding that it will not be exercised and that all will go on exactly as before. Anglicans are to be allowed complete independence except, perhaps, that the Archbishop of Canterbury is to report every ten years to the Pope. They are to be allowed to go back to the doctrinal position of the time before their separation in such matters as Transubstantiation and Papal Infallibility, since you cannot expect the poor things who have been isolated so long to learn in a few months what it has taken the more favoured part of the Church centuries to work out, and the Anglican Rite is to be continued for Anglican Uniat congregations and the Roman for Ultramontane Catholics. We hope it will be only "irritation" that the authorities of his Church will feel, but he evidently fears it will be more, and so, "on the principles of Safety First," signs himself "Father Jerome." But he may rest assured that, if a little irritated, Anglicans will not "dislike" him, but will be grateful for his sympathetic appreciation of our ways and his kind words about us.

Towards Reunion aims at getting its readers to see "what the Churches Stand For." Representatives of the chief religious bodies in England in alphabetical order (of writers on the title-page and of denominations in the book), the Baptists, the Church of England, Congregationalists, the Society of Friends, Methodism, and Presbyterianism, speak each in turn for themselves. The Roman Church and the Salvation Army are not represented, nor are Unitarians. The introduction explains the Aims and Methods of the Friends of Reunion, emphasising that the first step is mutual understanding. At the end of each chapter are books suggested for further reading and at the end of the whole are questions for discussion. The Student Christian Movement, that does so much for mutual understanding, evidently intends that the book should serve as a guide to such discussion, and for this it is well fitted. For discussion will probably reveal fundamental differences which the writers seem to minimize. Perhaps it would not be wise to insist on them in such a work, but I fear the plain man will

not gather a very clear idea of what it is all about. The writers all seem so afraid of hurting one another's feelings and stirring up controversy that it would be quite easy for him to think that the Nonconforming Bodies stood for Protestant Undenominationalism and the Church for Establishment. But that, no doubt, would be cleared up in discussion and by the further reading which the book suggests.

For the study of history shews us that the settlement of differences by free discussion is always a long process. It took the Church three hundred years to conquer Gnosticism and other heresies and to arrive at the Nicene Creed. Passion and bad temper hindered the end by turning discussion into controversy, and then the fatal step was taken of using force which turned controversy into persecution. So today Reunion would appear to be hopeless either by individual proselytising or by wholesome schemes. It is, it would seem, the last stage in the healing of divisions. First must come mutual respect; then the understanding of differences while dwelling on points of agreement; then co-operation wherever possible on matters in which no principle is sacrificed; then combination in teaching over areas of agreement, by lectures for instruction as distinct from sermons as part of worship; and so on to ministering to individuals by economy, while corporate reunion must be the final goal.

CLEMENT F. ROGERS.

COME, HOLY SPIRIT. Sermons by Karl Barth and Eduard Thurneysen. English translation by Drs. G. W. Richards, E. G. Homrighausen, and K. J. Ernst. T. & T. Clark. 6s.

The preface to this book states that it is the first volume of sermons from the Barthian school to appear in English. It is interesting to study the theology of that school, as it is expounded from the pulpit to normal Sunday congregations; for we are told that these sermons "were addressed to such men and women as one will find in any village or city church." Unfortunately the task has not yet been facilitated by the quality of the English translation. The book abounds in the worst *clichés* employed by preachers, in glaring split infinitives and in ungrammatical sentences. It may be that this defect has weakened the evangelical force of these sermons, and obscured the originality of their thought. Moreover, it is tiresome to the reader to find that the heading of each sermon gives no indication as to which of the two authors was responsible for it.

The content of these sermons is certainly most effective as a challenge to conventional churchgoers and ministers of religion. Their emphasis lies upon the need for a faith that transcends reason, and upon the complete surrender, indeed the kenosis, of himself which is required of every man by God; while their compelling dogmatic assertion of the claims of God refuses to descend to the level of mere apologetic argument. That method, as the sermon on Nicodemus reminds the reader, was that employed by Christ Himself in dealing with the respectably religious of his day. The weakness of the Barthian preaching would appear to lie in its failure to provide a gospel for the infidel. It is well to commend the attitude of the penitent publican to the Pharisee; but the publican too must be taught to cry, "God, be merciful to me a sinner." It is well to emphasize that faith transcends theology; but for many there are preliminary difficulties, among them intellectual difficulties, that need to be resolved before they can make the act of faith whereby they are justified. The true Paulinist

will not cease today from disputing on Areopagus, or from persuading king Agrippa. The complete distrust of the Barthian school for the intellectual approach to religion appears to lie in its acceptance of the doctrine of the complete depravity of human nature, a belief implied on almost every page of this book.

One further characteristic of these sermons is to be noted. God is always pictured as acting upon the individual soul, never upon a society, a church. There is much in these pages which bears on the first great commandment of the Law; it is astonishing how little there is which bears on the second.

HUMPHRY BEEVOR.

THE SCHOOL OF THE ETERNAL. By James O. S. Huntington, O.H.C., and Karl Tiedemann, O.H.C. The Centenary Press. 3s. 6d.

If we do not learn mental prayer, it will not be for lack of books to teach us. Every day seems to see the publication of a fresh one. *The School of the Eternal* is a book to buy and to use. A retreat-conductor might well employ the suggestions it gives, for they are clear, well-arranged and stimulating to further thought. The devout layman anxious to discipline himself by serious meditation will find it equally helpful. If you skim the book and lay it aside, it will convey nothing to you. Take it up day by day, follow out its methods, ponder its words and fill in its blanks, and you will find it a mine of spiritual gems.

ÆLFRIDA TILLYARD.

GOD WITH US: THEN AND NOW. By A. H. Walker, with a preface by Bishop Shaw. Faith Press. Paper, 2s.; cloth, 3s.

This is a book of lessons for Sunday School or Catechism for children who attend a Sunday Eucharist. Miss Walker does not tell us the age of the children she has in mind, but the lessons seem to be suitable to children of junior age, say nine to twelve. The problem that confronts any priest or other teacher is just how to give sufficiently definite and clear dogmatic teaching without being too narrowly concentrated upon a few most important doctrinal subjects. The more indirect methods of doctrinal teaching embodied in many Sunday School lesson books are undoubtedly open to the charge that they generally fail to leave a clear enough impression. On the other hand, such a concentrated presentation of doctrine as these forty lessons offer would seem to be open to the objection of over concentration. A good use of the very valuable material in this book would be to use groups of the lessons for a few Sundays at a time, occupying a rather larger number of Sundays with the wider spiritual teaching that other books supply. Most lesson books have groups of lessons which could be omitted without loss to make room for some of the lessons in Miss Walker's book.

A. R. BROWNE-WILKINSON.

SCIENCE AND THE SPIRIT OF MAN. By Julius Friend and James Feibleman. George Allen and Unwin. 12s. 6d.

THE UNIVERSE OF OUR EXPERIENCE. By L. M. Parsons. Williams and Norgate. 7s. 6d.

RIGHT. By Wyatt Tilby. Williams and Norgate. 7s. 6d.

These three books represent very well the confusion of outlook introduced by Modern Physics. Mr. Parsons is convinced that Science now

affirms human values and rejoices in it. The two American authors of *Science and the Spirit of Man* believe that it does not, and severely criticize it for that reason. Mr. Tilby is also convinced that it does not, and approves of it for that very reason.

Mr. Parsons is full of radiant optimism. "Science, while leading us further and further into mysterious realms of thought, now admits that it can give us only a symbolic representation of reality, and leaves us free to give such an interpretation of the mysterious background of phenomena as we may wish." As we may wish! That is the point. Science, by abandoning Materialism, has ceased to suggest any particular metaphysics, and the problem remains, as it always should have remained, a metaphysical problem. He is convinced that "our universe is largely psychically determined," and that "personality is its outstanding feature." Mr. Tilby, on the other hand, professes to draw from Modern Physics conclusions that are really due to the fact that he is a philosophical follower of Spinoza. His book is slightly fantastic. He "starts from the left foot of a tortoise and ends at the Right Hand of God." When he is dealing with cats and shell-fish, he is genial and human. As he lifts himself to higher themes, the cold blight of his master begins to fall upon him; and the second footnote on p. 144 is definitely offensive to Christianity. Good and evil for him, as for Spinoza, are a purely human, social contrivance. Even Beauty is relative and the austere face of Truth alone remains. God cannot be called Love, because the physical Universe contains no such meaning. He does not explain how it is possible to shew affection to a comet, or fatherly kindness to a nebula; we need here to remind ourselves of the saying, "After all, they are only hot air."

Science and the Spirit of Man is very critical of Science, because, for the ordinary person, it still means the old popular materialism, and the effect produced on the outlook of the multitude is "shocking." It makes life as "dull as a laundry bill." (We must remember the book is from America.) If the new theories of Physics are accepted, it would leave the mind free for higher constructions. If I am not mistaken, this is really a remarkable and noteworthy book. It shews that Science is always dealing with abstractions; that its "facts" are the very reverse of concrete; that what human experience affirms alone is real, and the more inclusive it is, the more real. It powerfully argues that happiness can only be found in the realm of the eternal values and not in the passing moment, yet its rejection of Christianity makes it end on a note of sombre tragedy. Man cannot be content with what passes away, yet the only salvation is "to dissipate the distortion of the present, thus making needless the categories of the past and, by removing time-partitions, to make all one, for ever." For so exalted an aim this life is too narrow a stage. Christianity, by widening the horizon and calling in God's redemptive purpose, discourages man's ambition, while it encourages man's hope.

F. H. BRABANT.

MODES OF FAITH. By Clement F. Rogers, M.A. London: S.P.C.K. 1934. 3s. 6d.

Few living writers have produced more effective works in the field of Apologetics than Professor Emeritus Rogers. His *Question Time in Hyde Park* is well known as an invaluable book of reference for all who have

to meet the shafts of inquirers, whether truth-seeking or sceptical. In *Modes of Faith* we have a series of lectures on popular philosophy which were delivered in Hyde Park on Sunday afternoons. As the author says in his Preface, there is urgent need of presentations of Christian Philosophy which will "get across" to the ordinary man, who has an uneasy feeling that Christianity is perhaps unable to make out its case, and who is somewhat afraid of tackling learned treatises on the subject. This book certainly does something to fill this need. It is an admirable and courteous defence of the Catholic Faith, based upon sound learning, and yet easy to be understood by the man of average intelligence.

The earlier chapters deal with questions of Knowing. Can we know ultimate truth? No, replies the intellectual Agnostic; and the root of his attitude is often just mental laziness. Most people shrink from and dislike stiff thinking. They prefer to leave things in a nebulous state of vagueness. They are always tilting at creeds and dogmas, because they do not want to commit themselves to anything definite. They are like the people in Professor Taylor's *Faith of a Moralist*, who keep their minds open simply because it is too much trouble to get up and shut the door. Then there are the people who rely on Reason, and on Reason only—the Rationalists. Valuable work has been done by those who insist on the claims of reason. Reason alone can meet objections that are raised by reason. In a sense the Scholastic philosophers were rationalists. They maintained, quite rightly, in the reviewer's opinion, that it is possible by reason alone to demonstrate conclusively the existence of God. But reason is not all. The rational way is but one of the ways by which man can obtain knowledge about God. The higher way is that of Faith, which accepts what God has revealed, not because it is evident to reason, but on God's authority—because God has revealed it.

Other chapters deal with inadequate theories of the world: Materialism, which says that matter is all; and Dualism, which sets up an irreconcilable opposition between matter and mind. The lecture on Atheism and Theism is an important one, and is worthy of close study. Some very big questions are raised and dealt with. Does God foreknow all that will happen? If He does, have we free-will? Is God limited? Can God suffer?

Perhaps the attack on Institutionalism is the one that is most often directed against the Church by the man in the street. "Call a religion 'institutional' and you have damned it in the eyes of the majority." On all sides we are continually hearing such foolish onslaughts as the following:

"We look through the window of institutional religion and find it blurred with the candles of innumerable altars lest our eyes should be dazzled with the brightness of metaphysical truth."

In *Faust*, Goethe has put the question of Institutionalism in classic form. Gretchen asks her lover why he does not go to Church; why he never goes to Mass and Confession. He then takes refuge behind a screen of vague phrases:

"Who dare express Him
And how profess Him?
Saying I believe in Him.
Who feeling, seeing,
Deny His being,
Saying I believe Him not?"

But his uninstitutional religion was powerless to save either of them from appalling moral disaster. We are always coming across the remark

that religion does not consist in going to Church, made by people who apparently think that it consists in *not* going. "Institutionalism is necessary in religion. To deny this is to deny facts of psychology. It is to fail to understand human nature."

It is fitting that the titles of the last two chapters in this excellent book should be Sacramentalism and Catholicism.

H. S. Box.

A Coptic Gnostic Treatise. A translation from the Coptic: Transcript and Commentary. By Charlotte A. Baynes. With photographs of the Text. Cambridge. 30s.

Apart from a few documents such as the *Hymn of the Soul*, embedded in the Acts of St. Thomas, the *Pistis Sophia*, and the unpublished *Apocryphon of St. John*, we are indebted for information as to the views of the great Gnostics to their opponents. The treatise here published has already appeared in French and German, but this is the first time that the text has been translated into English. The present edition includes a photographic reproduction of the text, which is the more important since the papyrus itself seems to be deteriorating. The whole volume has been produced with great care, and is a fine piece of work. The notes on the text are often extensive and illuminating, offering the reader material assistance in appreciating the meaning of the book and its place in Gnostic thought.

The document is imperfect, both beginning and end having been lost. The author is, therefore, unknown, but it is clear that he stood midway between Basilides and Valentinus, for in some points he agrees with the one and in some with the other, while there is but little in which he is independent of both. From his text, however, we realize that orthodox controversialists like Hippolytus and Irenæus did not misrepresent their opponents, and we welcome this new production as giving us an account of a Gnostic system otherwise unknown to us, which will help students of early Christian theology to appreciate better the meaning and extent of one of its most important movements.

T. H. Robinson.

Das Buch Deuteronomium. Übersetzt und erklärt von Dr. Hubert Junker. Bonn: Hanstein. Brosch. RM. 4.80; geb. RM. 6.40.

A very welcome Roman Catholic Commentary, shewing thorough scholarship and a real appreciation of modern studies, including Protestant works as well as those emanating from the author's own Communion. Dr. Junker defends the Mosaic authorship of Deuteronomy, though admitting inspired interpolations. He seldom argues positively for his position, but, wherever a passage has been held to indicate a comparatively late date, he has given his reasons for believing that it might be Mosaic. It may, perhaps, be admitted that these reasons are sometimes unconvincing, but Dr. Junker's principles, freely applied, leave room for a really scientific position, while his tone, even in controversy, is a model of fairness and courtesy.

T. H. Robinson.

BOOK NOTES

Bishop Bury of North and Central Europe. By Sophie McDougall Hine. Mowbrays. 2s. 6d. This little book is not so much a formal memoir as a series of vivid sketches of a very full and varied life. In his own words or those of his friends are described experiences ranging from an overcrowded voyage in Nicaragua to pastoral visits to Ruhleben and Soviet Russia. We are left with the impression not only of a very able bishop but of a gracious personality.

Side Notes on the Bible from Flinders Petrie's Discoveries. By Hilda Petrie. Search Publishing Co. 3s. 6d. These fifteen illustrated notes begin with the Hyksos and end with the discovery of the Coptic St. John at Qau. They range from the use of flint implements by Israel, to the building of the temple at Leontopolis. A chronological table at the end shews the patriarchs as comparatively modern.

A Second Sheed and Ward Anthology. 5s. Messrs. Sheed and Ward have brought out a series of appetisers from their list ranging from *Primitive Culture* by Christopher Dawson to *The Modern Chaos*, by Arnold Lunn, and touching most subjects in between—criticism, sociology, theology, biography and fiction. Some are complete in themselves and very appetising; others bear signs of lacking their contexts, and others again, to an Anglican, have that almost indefinable note of something foreign to our way of thinking that one feels in Westminster Cathedral.

La Bible et les Recits Babyloniens. By Charles-F. Jean. Bernard Crasset. 18 fr. This book, belonging to a series *La Vie Chrétienne*, is a notable example of *haute vulgarization*. In some 350 pages the author leads us from the earliest Babylonian documents to the books of the Maccabees, giving touches of historical background, literary introduction and numerous well-chosen quotations. Matters of biblical criticism are not so much discussed as assumed. In speaking of similarity of ideas, in which the literature of Israel, being so much later, may have been influenced by Babylonian thought, the author points out that, human nature being the same everywhere, there are certain fundamental principles which are bound to recur, more particularly when both nations have a common Semitic ancestry, and common traditions which he suggests may be due to a primitive revelation. There are marked similarities of literary form and method, but the monotheism of the whole Bible, and especially the monotheism, messianism and moral teaching of the prophets, secure the independence of the biblical outlook.

His Gifts and Promises. By James Moffatt, D.D. T. & T. Clark. 7s. This is a new volume in "The Scholar as Preacher" Series. On first looking into it one is inclined to say "just sanctified common sense." Then in reading, teaching or talk some point crops up which brings to mind a passage that touches the heart of the matter, and one begins to discern the ripe spiritual wisdom underlying the unpretentious phraseology. Not least suggestive are some of the titles, "Halfness"; "Nothing for the Casual"—on Matt. v. 8; "Impossible, thank God" —on Matt. xxiv. 23, 24.

M. D. R. W.

On being Human. By Gerald Vann, O.P. Essays in Order, 12. Pp. 110. Sheed and Ward. 2s. 6d. In a learned essay the writer reviews the humanism of the Greeks, of the Renaissance and of the present time, with special reference as regards the present time to Mr. Aldous Huxley. With each he contrasts the securer humanism of the religion of the Word made flesh. "Humanism can only flourish where vision is full and complete and at the same time hopeful and at peace." From another angle he views mechanization as thwarting the development of humanism, the true hope of which, he says, is in the Christian religion with its uniquely high valuation of personality. "It is the City of God that must be built on earth if humanist aspirations are to be wholly fulfilled."

A Free Church Liturgy. By J. P. Oakden, Ph.D. Pp. 27. Dent. 2s. Some simple forms of Communion service. The first is an attempt to reconstruct on scientific lines the original Latin rite. The second is a simplification of the Eastern Liturgy of St. Chrysostom. These are given as patterns, on the basis of which the "Free Church Liturgy" has been formed. The aim has been to maintain the order and content of the prayers, while translating them almost entirely into Scriptural language. The purpose has been well carried out.

Anima: The Pilgrim of the Cross. By L. V. Holdsworth. Pp. 62. Longmans, Green and Co. 2s. 6d. Ten pictures cut out of an early Victorian devotional manual, pasted in sequence on cardboard and framed, remembered by the writer as hanging on a wall of her home since early childhood, the book from which they were taken having been forgotten. They are now reproduced in their simplicity and crudeness with accompanying letterpress, which represents the writer's early ponderings upon their meaning. It is a simple Pilgrim's Progress, the pictured story of a Christian life, with its resistances, its subterfuges and its ultimate joyous obedience.

East and West in Religion. By S. Radhakrishnan. Pp. 143. George Allen and Unwin. 4s. 6d. Five lectures entitled Comparative Religion, East and West in Religion, Chaos and Creation, Revolution through Suffering and Rabindranath Tagore. "Asia represents the spiritual and Europe the intellectual" is his basic theme. He deprecates any Christian belittling of Eastern religions. He depicts the West as favouring vigorous life, theological definition and the ordering of religion by the ecclesia, and the East as non-dogmatic, individualistic, meditative, undefined. He views Christianity as an Eastern religion which has been very greatly transformed into something typically Western. "A Hindu looks at Christianity" might be a sub-title of the book. A Western man, dealing with such a subject, would arrive at some conclusions. This Eastern man, typically, gives us reflections.

H. L. C.

The Dramatic Personality of Jesus. By K. Dunlap and R. S. Gill. Williams and Norgate. 5s. With sincere sympathy with the authors' desire to free the portrait of Jesus from accretions, with admiration for the strenuous efforts made by them to do so, it is impossible not to come to the conclusion that they have been too vigorous in their treatment. They have but one object, to discover the Man. To them He is a Man who "utterly failed in His mission, and was completely vanquished by the powers against which He fought." We must agree

with them when they say "that the personality of Jesus outlined in the preceding pages is not the personality of the Christ as it is portrayed in Christian dogma." It certainly is not.

The Way to Happiness. Thoughts on the Beatitudes. By C. H. S. Matthews. S.C.M. 2s. This is a small book but well worth reading. The author is not afraid to take up the challenge of a certain modern philosophy. He accuses Mr. Russell of being a slave to his own reactions and mixing perversions of Christianity with the reality. Happiness to Mr. Matthews is a thing to be known on earth, not merely waited for until another world is reached. Its conditions are laid down in the virtues of the happy life as given by our Lord, but they are only to be acquired with great courage. Its secret lies in the courage to love.

An Anthology of Prayers. Compiled by A. S. T. Fisher. Longmans. 3s. 6d. This collection of prayers from the centuries and from the world, not only Christian, ought to be very useful. It is of a convenient size, and well printed. The selection has been carefully made, and must have entailed endless labour. It is impossible to be too grateful to those who take such pains to help people to pray.

Daily Messages from the Master. By Clement Humilis. Heffer. 2s. Clement Humilis must be well known by now in certain circles. His *Vox Domini* made a deep impression, and now we have given us in this slender volume, published by Heffer and Sons, Cambridge, a saying for each day in the year, culled from *Vox Domini* and his other book, *Vox Dilecti*. Those who know his smooth, rhythmic sentences, conveying often deep thoughts, will be glad to have this book into which they can dip from day to day.

W. E. L.

PRINTED IN GREAT BRITAIN BY BILLING AND SONS LTD., GUILDFORD AND ESHER